THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW

New Series, Vol. IV JANUARY, 1925 Number 4

CONTENTS

Religious Tolerance During the Early Part of the Reign of Constantine the Great — John R. Knipfing, Ph.D. 483

The Blessed Cardinal Bellarmine's Defense of Popular Government in the Sixteenth Century — John C. Rager, S.T.L. 504

The Formula of Baptism in the Early Church — Leo F. Miller, D.D. 515

The Belief in the Continuity of the Roman Empire Among the Franks of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries — Herman Fischer, D.D. 530

Necrology

Cardinal Logue 554

Miscellany

The Industrial Position of Woman in the Middle Ages 556

The Old Catholic Chapel and Graveyard Near Aquia, Stafford County, Va. 561

Chronicle 564

Book Reviews 578

(For a complete list of Reviews see next page)

Notices 621

Noteworthy Articles in Current Periodicals 631

Notes and Comment 637

The Greatest Church Edifice in the Western World; Education Week at the Catholic University; Butchering the Bible; The Lingard Society; Second Centenary of the Apostle of the Abenakis; A Tribute to Cardinal Ehrle; Pius XI Presents Splendid Folio Volumes to University Library; The New Library Building at the Catholic University; The Secret of St. Cuthbert's Tomb; All Roads Lead to Rome.

Books Received 658

Gettysburg, Pa.

PUBLISHED BY THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.
Issued Quarterly

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, $4.00 SINGLE NUMBERS, $1.00
FOREIGN COUNTRIES, $5.00

Entered as second-class matter Nov. 17, 1922, at the post-office at Gettysburg, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879

Copyright, 1924, By the Catholic University of America

CONTENTS

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE DURING THE EARLY PART OF THE REIGN OF CONSTANTINE THE GREAT ..... *John R. Knipfing, Ph.D.* 483

THE BLESSED CARDINAL BELLARMINE'S DEFENSE OF POPULAR GOVERNMENT IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY ..... *John C. Rager, S.T.L.* 504

THE FORMULA OF BAPTISM IN THE EARLY CHURCH. *Leo F. Miller, D.D.* 515

THE BELIEF IN THE CONTINUITY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE AMONG THE FRANKS OF THE FIFTH AND SIXTH CENTURIES. *Herman Fischer, D.D.* 536

NECROLOGY. CARDINAL LOGUE 554

MISCELLANY 556

The Industrial Position of Woman in the Middle Ages—The Old Catholic Chapel and Graveyard Near Aquia, Stafford County, Va.

CHRONICLE 564

BOOK REVIEWS 578

MURGOTTEN, *The Origins of the Islamic State;* BREHAUT, *History of the Franks, by Gregory, Bishop of Tours;* FELL, *Recent Problems in Admiralty Jurisdiction;* MCCANN, *The History of Mother Seton's Daughters;* SAVAGE, *The Congregation of St. Joseph at Carondelet;* FULLER, *Bismarck's Diplomacy at Its Zenith;* GRAHAM, *New Government of Central Europe;* ROBINSON-SMITH, *Our World To-day and Yesterday: A History of Modern Civilization;* FROTHINGHAM, *The Naval History of the Great War: Offensive Operations 1914-1915;* MITCHELL, *Frederick Law Olmstead: A Critic of the Old South;* SOUTHWORTH, *The Common Sense of the Constitution;* SCOFIELD, *The Life and Reign of Edward the Fourth, King of England and of France and Lord of Ireland;* FORD, *T. Jefferson Coolidge 1831-1920: An Autobiography;* HEBERT, *Selections from the Latin Fathers;* DUCHESNE, *The Early History of the Christian Church from Its Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century;* MACKAY, *Les Hopitaux et la Charite à Paris au XIII^e Siecle;* BART, *The Years of My Pilgrimage, Random Reminiscences;* HASKINS, *The Rise of Universities;* LORD, *The Origins of the War of 1870: New Documents from the German Archives.*

NOTICES 621

NOTEWORTHY ARTICLES IN CURRENT PERIODICALS 631

NOTES AND COMMENT 637

BOOKS RECEIVED 661

GETTYSBURG COMPILER PRINT, GETTYSBURG, PA.

BOOK REVIEWS

BART—*The Years of My Pilgrimage, Random Reminiscences*, by R. J. P. 611
BREHAUT—*History of the Franks, by Gregory, Bishop of Tours*, by Alfred H. Sweet 579
DUCHESNE—*The Early History of the Christian Church from Its Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century*, by P. W. B. 603
FELL, *Recent Problems in Admirality Jurisdiction*, by Frederick De Sloovere 580
FORD—*T. Jefferson Coolidge 1831-1920, An Autobiography*, by R. J. P. 597
FROTHINGHAM—*The Naval History of the Great War: Offensive Operations 1914-1915*, by Francis J. Tschan 592
FULLER—*Bismarck's Diplomacy at Its Zenith*, by Alfred H. Sweet... 585
GRAHAM—*New Governments of Central Europe*, by Francis J. Tschan 587
HASKINS—*The Rise of Universities*, by P. W. B. 613
HEBERT—*Selections from the Latin Fathers*, by Roy J. Deferrari.. 602
LORD—*The Origins of the War of 1870: New Documents from the German Archives*, by P. W. B. 617
MACKAY—*Les Hopitaux et la Charite à Paris au XIII^e Siecle*, by P. W. B. 609
MCCANN—*The History of Mother Seton's Daughters*, by M. B. D..... 582
MITCHELL—*Frederick Law Olmstead: A Critic of the Old South*, by Francis J. Tschan 594
MURGOTTEN—*The Origins of the Islamic State*, by A. Vaschalde..... 578
ROBINSON-SMITH—*Our World To-day and Yesterday; A History of Modern Civilization*, by Francis J. Tschan 589
SAVAGE—*The Congregation of St. Joseph at Carondelet*, by M. B. D. 584
SCOFIELD—*The Life and Reign of Edward the Fourth, King of England and of France and Lord of Ireland*, by W. O. Ault 595
SOUTHWORTH—*The Common Sense of the Constitution*, by D. A. McLean 595

BOARD OF EDITORS

Editor-in-Chief

RIGHT REV. THOMAS J. SHAHAN, D.D.

Managing Editor

REV. PATRICK W. BROWNE, D.D., Ph.D.

Associate Editors

VERY REV. PATRICK J. HEALY, D.D., Chairman
REV. VICTOR O'DANIEL, O.P., S.T.M.
CHARLES HALLAN MCCARTHY, Ph.D.
REV. HENRY IGNATIUS SMITH, O.P., Ph.D.
REV. PETER GUILDAY, Ph.D.
LEO F. STOCK, Ph.D.
RICHARD J. PURCELL, Ph.D.
REV. EDWIN J. RYAN, D.D.

Publication Office, Gettysburg, Pa.
Correspondence in regard to contributions and subscriptions should be sent to the Managing Editor, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

The
Catholic Historical Review

NEW SERIES, VOLUME IV JANUARY, 1925 NUMBER 4

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE DURING THE EARLY PART OF THE REIGN OF CONSTANTINE THE GREAT (306-313)[1]

The present is a moment especially auspicious for undertaking any study pertaining to the problem of religious tolerance or intolerance. The emotional quiescence of ante-bellum days had dimmed the critical vision of reputable historians: Montalembert, Renan and Lord Acton were of accord in their belief that the progressive spread of religious liberty was the outstanding historical achievement of modern times. The Great War and its aftermath have demonstrated the precarious nature of this achievement. Tribal manifestations were released,—nationalistic, racial, social, economic or religious in character,—which went far to demonstrate that human psychology remains fundamentally unchanged. Intolerance, not tolerance, has been and is still the polar star of man's destiny. This derives from the fact that he is a social being, a member of his groups—whether these be political, racial, national, cultural, professional, social, economic or religious. Social groupings are in greater or lesser degree intolerant, and that from the very necessity and purpose of their existence. All periods of human history have been intolerant, but with a shifting of emphasis to those particular interests which society and the group esteemed of vital importance to their given time and clime. Plato, Aristotle and Dean Inge have observed the course of world history with more penetration and exactness than Condorcet and H. G. Wells:—cyclic changes, pendulum swings, now forward, now

[1] Paper read at the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Historical Association, December 26-27, 1923.

backward, have been and still are the abiding characteristic of the history of civilization.

Such pendulum swings mark too, the history of the Roman Empire, even during the period from 250 to 313 A. D., which was the time of the major persecutions of Christianity by the Roman state: toleration under Philip the Arab, predecessor of Decius; the Decian Persecution; toleration and intolerance under Gallienus, and in like sequence under Valerian; religious indifference under Claudius Gothicus; tolerance followed by a flare-up of intolerance under Aurelian; twenty years of toleration under Diocletian, succeeded by the longest and most violent of persecutions—a spell of intolerance broken only by the Edict of Galerius (311) and the so-called Edict of Milan (313).

The reign of Constantine began on July 25, 306, the day which marked the death of his father, Constantius Chlorus. The son assumed the rule by the acclamation of his father's army in Britain. It was in the time of the persecution of the Christians by Diocletian's co-adjutors, Galerius and Maximinus Daja: the most intensive, extensive, enduring and inexorable campaign of religious intolerance ever conducted by the Roman state. The account of the intricate and detailed history of this persecution must be deferred to an occasion less taxing to the patience of *auditoire* and *conférencier* alike. Perhaps some observations of a general character will suffice.

The Diocletian Persecution (303-313) cannot be motivated, as Bouché-Leclercq would have it, on the ground that the aggressively intolerant and sectarian Christians forced the persecuting emperors to such measures of political and patriotic self-defense, for none of the official, pagan, and Christian sources corroborate the conjecture. Nor is the historical situation fully and accurately envisaged by attributing the persecution to the growing senility of Diocletian, his superstitious attachment to the omens of the haruspices and the oracles of Apollo, the exclusive initiative of Galerius, Christian incendiarism and plottings against the emperors' lives, Neoplatonist hostility to Christianity, or the disillusionment occasioned by the unsuccess of Diocletian's coinage and price-fixing measures. The main attribution is to be sought in the pagan piety and passion for reform of Diocletian himself. His pious concerns,—sincere, to

be sure, but much like the simple and superstitious beliefs of a Cato,—he affirmed in his legislation of 295 concerning legal marriages, his decree of 297 in condemnation of the Manichaeans, his Edict of Prices of 301, his revival of the cult of Jupiter and Hercules, and his late attachment to the cult of Mithras. On this score the testimony of Maximinus Daja, otherwise none too reliable, may be accepted with confidence. In his rescript of 312 to the Prefect Sabinus he wrote: "when our rulers and fathers, Diocletian and Maximinian, saw almost everyone deserting the worship of the gods and joining the Christians, they justly commanded all who had abandoned the worship of the immortal gods to be brought back to the fold by open force and punishment."

Renan characterized Diocletian as a "great reformer animated with the ancient spirit, who thought he could endow the Empire with new life by keeping within the narrow circle of Roman ideas." Mommsen was even more emphatic, for he wrote of Diocletian's governmental reforms as follows: "probably never before in the history of the world had a constitution been reversed by the ruling authority with such force, thoroughness, unity and logical precision,—a reorganization which embraced the throne, religion, the civil service, jurisprudence, administration, the army, and the system of taxation." It seems quite inevitable that a monarch with such a passion for curing the ills and regulating the conduct of the society of his time would undertake to suppress or incorporate within the new social and political order of things the one organization whose illegal status, disciplined direction and increasing power almost constituted it a state within a state, namely, Christianity.

The period of the Diocletian Persecution which ran its course from the date of Constantine's accession in 306 until the summer of 313 assumed the aspect of two distinct phases: the one, that of Galerius, which involved the persecuting activities of the Roman authorities throughout the length and breadth of the Roman Empire, excepting only Syria, Palestine and Egypt, and which ended with the publication of the Edict of Galerius in April, 311; the other, that of Maximinus Daja, which raged in the districts governed by him,—namely, Syria, Palestine and Egypt until Galerius's death in 311; with the addition of Asia

Minor thereafter,—and which terminated with the Licinian-Constantinian legislation of June and July 313. From the numerous sources and historical data of these two phases of the persecution we shall adduce only those considerations of a general nature having an immediate bearing upon our main problem, namely, the furtherance or retardation of the spirit of religious tolerance.

Two antithetical policies of dealing with the Christians were developed by the governing authorities: the one, of compulsion *à l'outrance* was sponsored to the full by Galerius and Maximinus Daja, and in lesser measure by Severus and Licinius; the other, of toleration, was achieved by Maxentius and Constantine. Galerius and Maximinus Daja were both the embodiment of the spirit of extreme intolerance, a compound of their respective temperaments, their barbaric and military nature and rearing, their narrowed political vision, and their religious views. Regarding the latter, we are reminded of a dictum of Professor G. L. Burr, to the effect that the history of mankind is an indication of the essentially religious, not irreligious, nature of intolerance. In the case of Galerius there seems to have existed a penchant for the *do ut des* character of the traditional cult of the *di publici populi Romani*, taken in its crassest political, military and political sense, and combined with the extreme form of fanatical Neoplatonism maintained by Hierocles, the governor of Bithynia, and his entourage. Maximinus Daja was probably the most bigoted, ruthless, pertinacious, and, in a persecuting sense, shrewdest opponent in the entire history of the Christian persecutions. A critical study of the sources leaves the impression that he was extraordinarily devoted to the conservative Roman cult of Jupiter and Mars, oracles and omens, libations and sacrifices. From the recent researches of Gelzer and Mispoulet we may conclude that he was gifted with a considerable genius for administrative organization. This organizing power he employed with much effectiveness in the task of reburnishing the Roman state religion, by repairing and founding many temples, by conducting an extensive campaign of public religious education of old and young,—of which the *Acta Pilati*, which slandered Christ and the origins of Christianity, was but a part,—and by creating a numerous pagan priesthood and hierarchy, which he

designed to be a powerful pagan catholic church and counterpoise to the Christian Catholic Church. He sought to bridge the gap in his personal deficiencies of education and culture by association with the Neoplatonist apologists of paganism, and so involved Christianity, as Batiffol has well observed, in a decisive campaign, during which Maximinus even made extensive use of propaganda and played engagingly upon the passions and credulity of the masses.

Both Galerius and Maximinus Daja continued, with but few interruptions, to enforce within their respective territories of Thrace and Asia Minor, Syria (inclusive of Palestine) and Egypt the various edicts of Diocletian, which had forbidden Christian religious meetings, and had commanded the destruction of the Scriptures, the deprivation of rank and citizenship of Christians serving the Roman state in an official capacity, the loss of liberty of the Christian members of the imperial household, the imprisonment of the Christian clergy, and the compulsion to sacrifice by the Christian laity. To the list of these edicts Maximinus added another providing, after the manner of Decius, for pagan sacrifice by every man, woman and child within the limits of his territory. The raging, intolerant zeal of both the emperors Maximinus and Galerius can perhaps best be gauged by referring to the *De martyribus Palestinae* of Eusebius and the detailed account of doings at Nicomedia contained in the *De mortibus persecutorum* of Lactantius.

After making all due allowance for the Christian provenance of this evidence, one must nevertheless conclude that the emperors, and with them their subordinates, the proverbial governors and magistrates, in their attempt to purge the army and civil service of Christians, to fortify the state authority against the Christian Church organization, and to force their unwilling Christian subjects into the narrow mould of pagan worship and reverence for the pagan gods, had resorted to legislation and methods of enforcement which were contrary in word, spirit and deed to the very essence of religious tolerance. In all fairness, however, it should be said that the persecuting activities of the provincial magistrates sometimes indicated a degree of leniency and amelioration dependent upon their respective personal dispositions. In measures of undue severity against the

Christians they were more aided and abetted than not by the generally intolerant attitude of the pagan masses.

The more authentic Acts of the Martyrs,—such as those of Bishop Philip of Heraclea, Agape, Eirene and Chione, Julius, Marcion and Nicander, Hesychius, Pasicrates and Valention, Bishop Quirinus of Siscia, Serenus of Sirmium, the Quattuor Coronati, Theodore of Amaseia, Phileas and Philoromus, Gurian and Samonas, the Thirty Seven Egyptian Martyrs, Balsam, and Dioscurus,—serve to corroborate these general impressions of pagan intolerance. Indeed, even the Jews, on an occasion such as the trial of Bishop Philip of Heraclea, exhibited a similar show of intolerance and Christian-baiting. Furthermore, these *acta martyrum*, however much they may differ from each other in *réquisitoire*, methods of torture and inflicted penalties, have this in common: they disclose a state of misunderstanding and a degree of intolerance mutual to both Christians and pagans, but rendered innocuous in the case of the former by their condition as the oppressed, and tyrannous in the case of the latter by the fatal power of the secular arm. A concern for historical truth prompts one to observe that the Christian martyrs, in their responses to the magistrates, indicated little or no understanding and respect for the pagan faith of their rulers and the majority of their fellow citizens. Perhaps an example will make this clear. In the highly credible Acts of Gurian and Samonas the governor interrogated the two Christians in this fashion: "our lords and masters, the unconquered kings, have commanded us that you should sacrifice to the image which is called Zeus, place incense upon the altar before it, and that you should abnegate your Christianity, because you are thoroughly wrong in not admitting that there are many gods." Whereupon Samonas replied that the truth was on the side of the Christians, who refused to make sacrifice to the image of Zeus, the wooden, which had been made by the hands of carpenters and with the nails of smiths. "We do not," said Samoas, "venerate the dull and speechless idol, for he is the product of an error which conducts to destruction." Statements of like inspiration one frequently encounters in reading the *Acta Sanctorum*. Their language, to be sure, does not reflect the disposition to sweet reasonableness with which we associate

the spirit of religious tolerance, but it should be noted in all fairness that the issue was one on which compromise for the society of Christians was entirely impossible, for that would have meant the complete renunciation of their monotheistic faith. Furthermore, there were exceptions among the Christian martyrs, and none more notable and noble than the case of Paul of Caesarea, martyred in the year 308. Eusebius describes his actions as follows:

> "He first prayed for his fellow Christians,—for the forgiveness of their sins, and the early restoration of their liberty. Then he asked for the conversion of the Jews through Christ, and proceeded to request the same things for the Samaritans. He also besought that those pagans who were in error and ignorant of God might come to a knowledge of him and adopt the true religion. Nor did he neglect the multitude of those present. He entreated the God of the universe in behalf of the judge who had condemned him to death, and in favor of the most mighty rulers, and of the individual who was about to behead him.....beseeching that their sin against him should not be reckoned against them. Having made these prayers,....moved almost all to compassion and tears, he made ready of his own accord, submitted his bare neck to the stroke of the sword, and was adorned with holy martyrdom."

The human sympathy, breadth of view, and sincerity of religious conviction made manifest in this recital will bear comparison with the fine-spirited pronouncements of the earlier Christian apologists, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Athenagoras, Melito of Sardis and Theophilus. Indeed, they can be paralleled with the stirring statement which Lactantius penned but a few years after 308 in his *Divine Institutes*, to the effect that "it is necessary to protect religion by dying for it, not by killing for it, by patience and not by cruelty; belief cannot be enforced, for he who lacks piety is useless to God." One will search in vain the sources and pages of ancient Greek and Roman history for a similar comprehension and sympathetic penetration of the problem of religious tolerance.

If you will recall, we suggested in the earlier part of this study that, with the year 306 as our point of departure, the first phase of the persecution was the Galerian, which terminated with the publication of the Edict of Galerius in April, 311.[2] To the interpretation of this Edict of Toleration let us now devote

[2] The pages which follow, devoted to critical study of the Edict of Galerius, recapitulate the writer's views as contained in the article (with source references): "The Edict of Galerius (311 A. D.) re-examined," in *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, I (1922), pp. 693-705.

our attention. Perhaps the best explanation of its origin is still that of Gibbon: "the frequent disappointments of his ambitious views, the experience of six years of persecution, and the salutary reflections which a lingering and painful distemper suggested to the mind of Galerius, at length convinced him that the most violent efforts of despotism are insufficient to extirpate a whole people."

Galerius's illness I regard as merely one of the conditioning circumstances of the edict's publication, and believe that modern writers have been prone to overemphasize this factor in the motivation of the decree—misled perhaps by the exaggerated efforts of Eusebius and Lactantius to prove that the Lord had the most horrible of earthly fates in store for all persecutors of the Christians. Then again, certain Neoplatonist influences, as shown by the expressions *instituta veterum* and *secta parentum* contained in the text of the decree, are not motives, but conditioning circumstances. Probably the most fruitful explanation of recent years is that the Emperor Licinius was present with Galerius at Sardica when the edict was formulated and published, and had much to do with the change of imperial policy, perhaps with the political purpose of winning the favor of Constantine by concessions to the Christians, and of counteracting the political effects of the pending alliance between Maximinus Daja and Maxentius.

The edict is given in two versions: the Latin copy of Lactantius contained in the *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, and a Greek translation which Eusebius incorporated in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. It was issued in the name of the four emperors, Galerius, Licinius, Maximinus Daja and Constantine. It commenced with an attempt to justify, or at least explain, the origin of the persecution enactments of Diocletian, Galerius, and their colleagues, to this effect: the emperors, in their determination to improve the internal conditions of the empire, undertook to restore the Roman virtues of old by a strict application of the ancient laws and a careful supervision of social customs. This work of political and social regeneration, the edict stated, had encountered the opposition of the Christians, who, although primarily a religious group, had failed to observe the principle of Roman law that all foreign cults should be national and not

composed of different nationalities. The Christians, it affirmed, had had a much shorter history than the Romans, in whose empire they lived as subjects, and had nevertheless presumed to create and live by a set of principles and practices which rivalled and opposed Roman law, traditional religion, and social practice. Indeed, some of these very Christians, with their new laws and customs, might have been the descendants of those early Romans who had of yore founded the state and its venerable institutions.

The edict continued its argument in this wise: the emperors had therefore been impelled to issue an edict (in 303) designed to bring the Christians into harmony with ancient Roman tradition, but the effects were neither those desired nor anticipated, for the number of Christians brought back into the pagan fold or eliminated (by the death sentence, imprisonment or exile) by no means equalled the total of those who continued to survive, firm in the faith. Furthermore, the affairs of state during the interval of persecution had not prospered as well as they might have: civil wars, usurpations and conspiracies had occurred, the state finances had gotten into a mess, an economic depression existed, and the very life of the senior Augustus was threatened by disease.

One of the causes of this sad state of affairs, the edict maintained, had been the presence in the empire of so considerable a number of non-worshiping Christians, become to all intents and purposes godless, since they showed cult devotion neither to the pagan gods, as the terms of the persecuting decrees prescribed, nor to their own Christian God, because of the persecution. This is a most singular admission on the part of Galerius, for he hereby concedes a certain efficacy of power to the Christian God—the conception is still polytheistic, but not irreconcilable with the henotheistic and syncretistic tendencies then current under the influence of the Neoplatonists. Galerius thus recognized the divine authority of the Christian God and the pagan deities, but regarded them as separate concepts and in no case as mutually exclusive.

These were the reflections, according to the edict of toleration, which had induced Galerius to exercise in behalf of the Christians his wonted mildness and clemency,—a set chancellery

form,—by ordering the immediate cessation of the persecution, and by pardoning the Christians for their disobedience to the imperial laws and customs in the past, and, by implication, for the future also. The edict then laid down the legal principle, which forms its decisive feature, *ut denuo sint Christiani et conventicula componant, ita ne quid contra disciplinam agant.* By declaring that the Christians might again exist as such, Galerius had in mind the *de facto* status of the Christians before 303. But this very juridical ruling of Galerius made the legal condition of Christianity after 311 different from that in operation before 303. For the first time in the empire's history the Christians were specifically and legally granted the right of professing their faith and practicing their cult; that is, they were officially recognized as belonging, just as the Jews, to a *religio licita,* or perhaps more correctly, to *collegia licita.* The Christians were also permitted to re-establish their *conventicula,* namely, their religious meetings and their church buildings. In other words, to the right of association already conceded, Galerius added the right of assembly. The Roman state had been accustomed to exact of its citizens in their private worship and of its non-citizens in their public worship the condition that nothing should be done against good order, the government, the law, and public morals. This seems to be the significance of the clause, *ut ne quid contra disciplinam.* If the elasticity of the expression enabled Maximinus Daja subsequently to burden Christianity with restrictions, it is to be noted that it might also be so interpreted by Constantine and Licinius as to leave them unhampered in their liberal application of the edict's provisions within their own territories. Besides, one can fairly conclude from the *conventicula componant* that Galerius intended thereby to recognize all ecclesiastical property rights of the Christians as legal, which had not been confiscated by the imperial *fiscus* up to the time of the edict's promulgation, or which might be acquired by the Christian Church subsequently, for otherwise the concession to them of the rights of association and assembly would become inoperative and a farce. It was probably contrary to his intention to make a wholesale restitution of the real and personal property of the Church taken over during the persecution, for such an important concession would have been

specifically mentioned in the contents of the decree. Yet it is equally certain that most of the churches would have to be restored to the Christians forthwith, for they were necessary to make effective Galerius's earnest wish that the Christians should directly devote their divine services and prayers in part at least to the welfare of their rulers and the Roman state.

Perhaps the most fitting commentary which can be made upon the Edict of Galerius is the statement by Eusebius, that even in the territory of the arch-persecutor, Maximinus Daja, the Christians "called together their congregations in every city, thronged the meetings for divine service, and observed the ceremonies of established usage"; and that Maximinus "allowed this to go on in this way for almost six months."

If such a favorable interpretation of the clauses of the Galerian decree actually operated within the territory of Maximinus, it is not illogical to suppose that the more friendly disposed emperors, Constantine and Licinius, conceded less to the Christians of their respective lands. It is even possible that Constantine, at least, interpreted the *conventicula componant* in so generous a fashion as to return to the Christian Church whatever of its real property,—confiscated in the course of the Diocletian Persecution,—still remained in the possession of the *fiscus*.

It therefore appears to be advisable to attach greater importance to the Edict of Galerius in its juridical aspects,—even though it be the work of *jusqu 'à boutist* pagan,—than has been its general lot at the hands of historical scholarship. With this legislative enactment the old formula, *non licet esse Christianos*, was definitely shelved, Christianity became a tolerated cult on a par with Judaism, with its rights of association, assembly, conscience, cult, and future property legally safeguarded. With it too began, as Wissowa acutely observed, a genuine religious revolution among the Romans which led in but three generations time to the complete destruction of the Roman state religion. Even to its contemporaries the Edict of Galerius seemed to mark an epoch and turning-point in the history and destinies of the Christian Church, for the Father of Church History undertook immediately thereafter and in celebration thereof his first editions of the *Ecclesiastical History* and the *Martyrs of Palestine*.

Just as the Edict of Galerius of 311 may be said to have concluded the Galerian phase of the Diocletian persecution, so it may be affirmed that the Licinian-Constantinian legislation of 313 terminated the phase of Maximinus Daja. This legislation has generally gone under the name of the Edict of Milan, and has been ascribed to the initiative and action of Constantine the Great. We all recall the encyclical letter of Pope Pius X which was issued on March 8, 1913, to celebrate the 16th centennial of the "event which finally brought peace to the Church." This encyclical added that "it seems especially opportune to celebrate therewith the promulgation at Milan of the Edict of Constantine the Great, which followed soon upon the victory against Maxentius, putting an end to the cruel afflictions of the Christians and vouchsafing them freedom."

May I remind my audience that this statement in the encyclical is an affirmation of an historical character, and does not involve the question of faith and morals. Historical facts and their veracity know but one abiding test, namely, that of historical criticism. Paul Allard, the historian of the persecutions once observed: "l'histoire n'a pas à faire d'apologétique; c'est aux faits seuls à parler."

I make these observations because it is precisely the question of the authenticity of the Edict of Milan which must be so determined. Certain scholars of to-day follow Otto Seeck, the historian of the *Untergang der antiken Welt,* in denying the very existence of that decree. Seeck published an article in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* on "The so-called Edict of Milan" back in 1891, in which he not only made this denial but declared that the two texts of the decree contained in the *De mortibus persecutorum* (Ch. 48) of Lactantius, and the *Church History* (X. 5, 2-14) of Eusebius had been published not at Milan, but in different provinces of the East; that both texts had been proclaimed not by Constantine but by Licinius after the defeats administered to Maximinus Daja, and had therefore referred exclusively to the religious problems of the East, and not to Maxentius, the Milvian Bridge, nor the religious conditions in the West. Seeck never adduced the source-proofs necessary for the establishment of his thesis, made statements in his writing of an immoderately categorical and contentious char-

acter, and by the suppression of facts indispensable to a careful commentary on the decree's origin, nature and contest did much to distort the historical truth.

It is nevertheless true that there is no definite and positive proof of the actual promulgation and existence of the Edict of Milan.[3] The texts given by Lactantius and Eusebius are nowhere cited by them, whether in rubric or in commentary, as the Edict of Milan. I have carefully gone through all the important medieval chroniclers of ecclesiastical and universal history, without finding the slightest mention of the Edict of Milan as such. In other words, the historical tradition of the existence of that decree is post-medieval. The first reference I found dates from the later 16th Century, and appeared in the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Baronius. In this connection Baronius ventured to describe the Eusebian document as an edict issued by Constantine and Licinius at the time of the Milan conference. The actual designation "Edict of Milan" (*edictum Mediolani*) as such only came into existence a full century after Baronius—the scholar Pagi used it for the first time in his critical annotations to the *Annales* of Baronius. In 1678, several decades before the work of Pagi, Baluze had uncovered the only existing manuscript of the *De Mortibus Persecutorum* and had declared the respective decrees contained therein and in the Eusebian Church History to be one and the same edict.

Thus it might be said that by the year 1700 the tradition had become established that an Edict of Milan, granting the Christians complete religious liberty in the Roman empire, had been published by the emperors Constantine and Licinius. The popularization of this view and its universal acceptance until the last decade of the Nineteenth Century may be attributed to the writings of Tillemont and Gibbon.

Since the publication of Seech's article two Catholic scholars, Sesan and Wittig, have studied the textual differences existing between the Latin and Greek texts of the two decrees published by Lactantius and Eusebius respectively, and have come to the conclusion that Eusebius quoted in a Greek translation the origi-

---

[3] What follows is a summary of the writer's views contained in the article, "Das angebliche Mailänder Edikt v. J. 313 im Lichte der neueren Forschung," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1922, pp. 206-218.

nal edict (or rescript) of Milan, and that Lactantius merely transmitted a later rescript, based thereon but published at Nicomedia.

This view I am unable to share. I have studied critically both the Lactantian and Eusebian texts of the decree and come to the conclusion that the point of departure and key to the whole problem is the introductory section of the Eusebian version of the decree. This section was not included in the Lactantian version of the decree because its contents and references did not apply to the territorial circumscription of that Lactantian textual decree, namely, the province of Bithynia. The Eusebian introduction is to be interpreted as follows: Licinius, and with him Constantine, had long been of the sincere conviction that religious liberty should be for all, and had, by the Edict of Galerius, sanctioned such freedom of choice and worship. But in the circular letter of the Eastern prefect Sabinus, which had been dictated and inspired by Maximinus Daja, and had been designed ostensibly to extend the benefits of such religious liberty to the inhabitants of Syria, Palestine and Egypt (all ruled by Maximinus), this grant had been worded so ambiguously that by subsequent interpretation "many and diverse conditions seemed clearly to have been added, and it came to pass, perhaps, that some of the Christians were torn from such observance." This interpretation will explain the inclusion of the introduction by the Eusebian version, and logically compel its exclusion by the Lactantian, for the Edict of Galerius had actually been published in Nicomedia (where the Lactantian version of the so-called Edict of Milan was posted) and all of Asia Minor, which was the territory of Galerius until his death, whereas Maximinus Daja had dispensed with its publication in his own territories of Syria, Palestine and Egypt, and had dispatched instead the less generous circular letter of his perfect Sabinus.

Our discussion thus far has been devoted to the interpretation of the Eusebian introduction. It remains to consider its motivation, or the why and wherefore of it. In contrast to the views of Crivellucci and Wittig, I am inclined to believe that there existed sufficient considerations of policy at the time to induce Linicius to add such an introduction to the form of the decree which he intended to publish in the Diocese of the East

(Syria, Palestine and Egypt). On the basis of our foregoing analysis the Eusebian introduction can be resolved into two component parts: (1) the reference to the friendly concern for the Christians which Licinius and Constantine had already manifested by their joint publication of the Edict of Galerius; and (2) the nullification of the intolerant conditions imposed upon the profession and exercise of the Christian faith by the ambiguous contents of the circular letter of Sabinus and their subsequent and malevolent interpretation. To have incorporated the first of these sections with his Nicomedian decree would not have furthered the political interests of Licinius, for in Bithynia, the province in which the deceased Galerius had made his personal headquarters, all praiseworthy mention of the terms of the Edict of Galerius would have redounded to the personal glory not of Licinius and Constantine, but of Galerius. The second section, could obviously not be included in a Nicomedian decree, for it bore no relation to the Bithynian situation. It seems, however, that Licinius, in proclaiming the decree for Bithynia and Asia Minor as well as for the Diocese of the East, pursued much the same policy, namely, the purpose to gain for himself and Constantine the friendship of the numerous Christians of the former territories of Maximinus. Moreover, to convince them of his own and Constantine's tolerant policy and friendly disposition, Licinius resorted to the same expedient in both decrees: he laid particular stress upon the Milan conference and decisions of Constantine and himself for the future regulation of the religious affairs of the East. Licinius evidently thought it also wise to contrast for the Christian population, formerly subject to Maximinus in Syria, Palestine and Egypt, the advantages, which should have accrued to them by the Edict of Galerius, with the disadvantages of the circular letter of Sabinus, substituted by Maximinus therefor.

The conclusion follows that the Licinian document, which Eusebius has preserved for us, could not have been promulgated in the Diocese of the East until Licinius had actually conquered this territory from Maximinus, that is, until after the definite defeat of Maximinus and his subsequent death in Cilicia. As we know from Eusebius, Maximinus issued a remarkably extensive edict of toleration shortly before his death, in content so

similar to the Nicomedian decree of Licinius, that we may regard it as modeled thereafter. In this edict Maximinus avoided all mention of the Edict of Galerius and his instructions for its enforcement as contained in the circular letter of Sabinus, but passed directly from the opening of the persecution by the edicts of Diocletian and Maximian to his own letter of 312 to Sabinus (*H. e.* IX. 9a, 1-9). If the clauses of the Eusebian introduction bearing on the Edict of Galerius and the circular letter of Sabinus had actually been contained in the Nicomedian decree which he used as his model, Maximinus might have been tempted to add to the content of his edict some attempted justification for his conduct in 311.

After the overthrow of Maximinus, as before, Licinius' object was to gain the good will of the oriental Christians by the realization of a most generous program of toleration. For this purpose he availed himself of an argument, which combined both negative and positive features: he circulated among the provincials of Syria, Palestine and Egypt a decree, whose main text repeated the tolerant measures of the Nicomedian constitution, but whose introduction aimed especially to denounce the insincerity of Maximinus and to weaken the good impression which Maximinus' edict of toleration might have exercised upon the Christians. Precisely because he proposed to establish the dishonesty of the latter's intentions toward the Christians by reminding them of the chicanery of the circular letter of Sabinus, Licinius gave evidence of his own and Constantine's identification with the Edict of Galerius, and the early and friendly disposition which they both had entertained in regard to the Christians.

There remains, as we have already noted above, the task of identifying the addressee of the Eusebian constitution. Since in our study of the special nature of the Eusebian introduction we observed it to conform especially to conditions peculiar to the Diocese of the East, it would follow that the *constitutio* of Licinius reported by Eusebius was addressed to an official whose jurisdiction was within that territorial circumscription. Because we know that Licinius addressed the *constitutio* of Nicomedia to the governor of Bithynia, we may fairly assume that the Latin archetype of the Eusebian version was addressed to

the governor of Palestine, who published it with his own edict, thus affording Eusebius, at Caesarea at the time, the opportunity of copying it and having it subsequently translated for incorporation with the second edition of his Church History.

Consequently we may regard the Latin and Greek documents reported by Lactantius (*de mort.* 48) and Eusebius (*hist. eccles.* X. 5, 2-14) as two distinct versions of the one constitution of Licinius, addressed respectively to the governors of Bithynia and Palestine, and designed primarily to remove all previous conditions which Maximinus had imposed upon the Christians in the profession of their faith, the exercise of their religion and cult, and in the enjoyment of their corporate property rights. Juridically and genetically considered, this constitution of Licinius established in the Diocese of the East the general conditions of religious toleration for the Christians which had already become operative in the territories of Constantine and Licinius by the Edict of Galerius, namely, Christianity became a *religio licita* with its rights of association, assembly, conscience and cult legally safeguarded. The Edict of Galerius, it has been noted, even afforded the Christians a certain legal security in the collective acquisition and administration of the ecclesiastical property rights they might seek to obtain after April 30, 311. The Licinian decree defined and gave greater precision to this conception by referring distinctly to the *corpus Christianorum* and to the *corpus et conventicula eorum.* It provided also for the immediate restitution of all the real property of the church (*loca ad ius corporis eorum, id est, ecclesiarum, pertinentia*) which had been confiscated during the preceding period of persecution, and which had in the meanwhile come into private hands. No mention is made in the decree of restitution by the state of the real property of the church still in the possession of the *fiscus*, but the provincial governor would not be the resort for instructions of such a purport, and we may conclude that the logic of the situation induced Licinius to send the necessary directions to the treasury officials. More serious is the omission of any mention of the personal property of the church, and of the real and personal property of individual Christians, which had been taken over by the *fiscus* during the persecution. There is little reason to believe that such property was restored—for

the personal property, the difficulties in the location and evaluation of the objects owned would have been insuperable. However, even in its provision for the partial restitution of confiscated property, the Licinian constitution went beyond the terms and intentions of the Edict of Galerius, for this decree, as we saw above, made not the slightest mention of any restitution of confiscated real or personal property.

There too is no disguising the fact that there is a marked contrast between the Edict of Galerius and the Constitution of Licinius as to the spirit and temper of mind which their respective framers reflected. It may be said that whereas the former decree constitutes a landmark in the history of toleration, the latter marks an epoch in the history of tolerance. The fine appreciations by Boissier and Pichon should be read in order to understand and feel the great value of the Licinian constitution in this respect. Whereas Galerius had commenced his edict with an attempted justification for the preceding persecution, and a thinly-veiled regret that it had not succeeded in its designs against the Christians, Licinius (and with him Constantine, for they had resolved together at Milan upon a common and general religious policy for the East) announced at once a principle new to the public law of his day and the mentality of his age: *ut daremus et christianis et omnibus liberam potestatem sequendi religionem quam quisque voluisset.* The principle proclaimed was not the result of the mature reflections of a philosophic mind, nor the act of a convinced champion of disestablishment, nor of an unbelieving rationalist, nor of a devoted individualist and libertarian. It is the work of a mind formed entirely in the antique mould in the sense that he is convinced of the intimate connection between imperial welfare and divine power or favor. Indeed, it is probably due to this conviction and the desire to profit by it that the author grants to the Christian and other (i. e. the unofficial, non-state) faiths the free profession and exercise of their religions. Boissier has emphasized the fact that this phrase is five times repeated in the body of the decree,—perhaps it should be added that the appeal to the aid and the consideration of the divinity is made just as frequently. The expressions used to designate this divine power are always vague (*divinitatis reverentia, divinitas in sede caelesti, summa divini-*

tas, divinus iuxta nos favor) and indicate a type of pagan monotheism popular at the time: the devotion to an impersonal deity, —called the *summus deus* by both Constantine and Licinius,— which was supposed to be common to all religions, and which manifested itself under different aspects and conditions to each. A ruler who believed that the different divine emanations were at unison with one another in the celestial all, might also conclude that the earthly cults by which each emanation was respectively worshiped should likewise dwell harmoniously among themselves—particularly since the maximum benefits would accrue to the rulers and state through a peaceful and uninterrupted devotion to each cult. This conception represented a religious formula more agreeable to the pagan-minded Licinius with his momentary Christian political leanings than to the more Christian-minded Constantine with his acquiescence in pagan religious concessions. Although a contributory factor, this interpretation fails to offer a full and satisfying explanation of the fine and startling modern spirit of religious tolerance so clearly manifested in the entire decree. The inspiration of this I believe to have been Constantinian; the formulas and tolerant sentiments were communicated verbally to Licinius by Constantine on the occasion of their meeting in Feb-Mar., 313. No political action of Licinius during the following ten years of his rule warrants the supposition that he was possessed of tolerant views and religious convictions; nay more, his later persecution of the Christians is evidence to the contrary. But Constantine, even during his years of sole supremacy, from 323 to 337, gave every evidence, and that often under conditions of extreme provocation, of sincerely endeavoring to conform the exercise of his political and coercive power strictly to the letter and spirit of the Nicomedian-Palestinian decree of 313. This thesis, I believe, can be maintained by the critical study of Constantine's relations with the official Catholic Church, Athanasius, Donatism, Arianism, the minor heterodox sects of Christianity, paganism and Judaism.

From the foregoing, however, it cannot be concluded that Constantine and Licinius published their Milan deliberations in the form of a constitution, edict, or rescript of Milan. Juridically considered, there would have been no justification for the

promulgation of such a decree in the West, for Constantine and Licinius had already interpreted the Edict of Galerius as a grant of religious liberty, whether of conscience or of cult. A careful analysis and interpretation of the Licinian constitution, both in the Latin and Greek versions shows that the religious problems of the East and not the West were dealt with. A textual study of the Lactantian version leaves with one the distinct impression that Licinius and Constantine were occupying themselves with religious problems of the future rather than of their contemporaneous present. Not even the recognition of the complete juridical personality of the Christians involved in the ordered restitution of ecclesiastical property can be regarded as motivated by the legal status of the Christian communities in the West, for this opinion seems contradicted by the evidence of a like decision of Constantine's in his rescript (*Hist. eccles.*, X. 5, 15-17) to Anulinus, proconsul of provincial Africa. This decree can be dated either before or after the time of the Milan conference of Licinius and Constantine:—if before the conference it shows that Constantine had already recognized the corporate capacity of the Christian communities, jointly as well as severally; if after the conference, it would have been an entirely unnecessary repetition of a Milan decree. If an edict of Milan had actually been issued, Linicius would, in republishing its essential contents in a subsequent legislative enactment, naturally have referred to the Milan decree as such. An edict of Milan, which dealt with the religious conditions of the West, would have also borne the name of Maximinus, in conformity with the principle of imperial collegiality. Why then did not Maximinus, after his defeat by Licinius, resort to the simple expedient of its publication, instead of promulgating an entirely new edict which in substance, however, was its replica? Nor is the testimony of Eusebius (*H. E.*, IX. 9, 12. 9a, 12; X. 5, 2-14) sufficiently convincing to establish the existence of such a Milan decree. One may, to be sure, agree with Wittig that Eusebius, judged by his remarks contained in the *Church History*, IX. 9, 9a, 12, believed that Constantine and Licinius has issued a general law of toleration before the outbreak of the war between Licinius and Maximinus. But that Eusebius held this decree to be identical with

the constitution which he published in X. 5, 2-14 is an incorrect assumption, for the manuscript studies of Schwartz establish the fact that the collection of imperial laws given by Eusebius in X. 571 had originally (i. e., in the second edition) been at the end of Book IX, that is, directly after the account of Maximinus' overthrow and end. Although the Greek version of the Licinian constitution leaves with the reader the impression that the Milan resolutions of Constantine and Licinius were officially published at Milan, the Lactantian version will serve as the proper corrective of the faulty work of the Eusebian translator. Contemporary literature was singularly silent as to the existence of such a Milan decree. Eusebius clearly mentioned it neither in the *Hist. eccles.*, nor in the *Chronica*, nor in the *Vita Constantini*, nor did Lactantius give any inkling of its historical existence.

JOHN R. KNIPFING, Ph.D.,
Asst. Professor of European History,
Ohio State University.

THE BLESSED CARDINAL BELLARMINE'S DEFENSE OF POPULAR GOVERNMENT IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY[1]

The beatification of the Venerable Jesuit Cardinal Robert Francis Romulus Bellarmine, May 13th, 1923, has brought into present day prominence a saint and a scholar who in the trying times of the sixteenth century stood out as a tower of strength in defense of the Church of Christ and the traditional and ancient rights of the people. Cardinal Bellarmine was unquestionably the most remarkable man of his age. He was born at Monte Pulciano, Italy, in 1542 and died in 1621. As a priest and ecclesiastic he was lauded by his brother cardinals as the counterpart of St. Charles Borromeo. He is described as a man of prayer, simplicity, and poverty, of singular delicacy of conscience, lavishly charitable, and intensely devoted to his work. As a man of letters and science, he occupied with notable success, chairs in Florence, Mondovi, Piedmont, Louvain, and Rome. As an orator, he attracted great audiences of Catholics and Protestants. As a controvertionalist, Cardinal Ubaldinus compared him with an Athansasius or an Augustine. By other contemporaries he was referred to as "the pillar of Christian faith," "the great Christian athlete," "a light dispersing the darkness and soothing the chilled world of his time." Pope Clement VIII said of him, "The Church of God has not had his equal in learning." Cardinal Valevius is quoted as saying of him, "I have scarcely found so many good qualities in a number of excellent men as are combined in this one great apostle of our age."

It is solely, however, as a remarkable political thinker, that Blessed Cardinal Bellarmine will engage our attention in this paper. The very principles which the modern world prizes so highly as the foundation of popular and democratic government, and which have procured for millions the pursuit of "life, liberty and happiness," found their vindication and elucidation in the writings and discourses of this Catholic priest 300 years ago.

[1] Paper read at Fourth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Columbus, O., Dec. 26-27, 1923.

An investigation of his writings reveals to us, that: at a time when the trend towards royal autocracy had grown strong enough for "divine right" theorists to proclaim absolute monarchy as the best and solely legitimate form of government; when royal heads were tracing the origin of their power from the Olympic heights of divine appointment; when as a sacred and royal caste they set themselves apart from and above the rest of mankind and were no longer content to deck their brows with the crown of temporal power but coveted likewise the tiara of spiritual supremacy; when political rights were being denied, passive obedience and non-resistance unconditionally demanded; when civil and religious liberty, human dignity and equality, were being trampled under foot, there stepped out before the despotic court of that day, with something of dramatic vigor and majestic heroism, like another John the Baptist or an Ambrose, this staunch and fearless cardinal of the ancient Church. With calm dignity and clarity of mind he insisted that the more useful form of government is practically democratic and popular; that sovereignty, though from God, is vested in a ruler by consent of the people; that constitutional and ecclesiastical limitation be continued; that every state and people has a natural right to determine its own form of government and to resist a tyrannical rule. In unfaltering terms he defined the authority and obligation of kings and laid down the principles of civil and religious liberty, of human dignity and equality.

The two following declarations contain the gist and trend of the two great diverging political theories that contended for supremacy in the 16th century. *"In a commonwealth all men are born naturally free; consequently the people themselves immediately and directly hold the political power so long as they have not transferred this power to some king or ruler."* (*De Clercicis*, Ch. VII.).

"This tenet was first hatched in the schools and hath been fostered by all succeeding papists," (ROBERT FILMER; *Patriarcha*, Ch. I.) for, *"The most sacred order of kings is of divine right."* (Constitution and Canons of the Church of England).

The first was the theory of Cardinal Bellarmine and the traditional view of the Catholic Church throughout the Middle

Ages. The second was the new theory of "The Divine Right of Kings" and the accepted political doctrine of the Church of England and religious dissenters of the sixteenth century. The one was essentially democratic, the other autocratic. The causes which led up to so pronounced a division of political thought at this time were principally: (1) the recognized political influence of the Papacy throughout the Middle Ages; (2) the trend towards nationalism; (3) the conditions arising from a departing feudalism; and (4) the politico-religious upheval of the sixteenth century.

Before the religious revolt of the sixteenth century European society found its fixed and powerful center of political gravitation and balance in the unifying and harmonizing power of the Papacy. After the defection, the imperative need of such a fixed and strong central power was still felt. Monarchy which had long been aspiring to absolute power, grasped the opportunity and immediately stepped forward to proclaim its superior competency to supply such a need.

At the close of the sixteenth century the existence and preponderance of monarchy was well recognized but the question to be solved was: should royal monarchial power, as the divine right theorists expounded it, become absolute,—should it so decisively prevail that the other two elements of recognized government, viz., aristocracy and democracy, be completely discarded from the political world; or, should a combination of the three, which had hitherto existed, continue. Cardinal Bellarmine contended for a continuation of the combination. He insisted upon a retention of what we to-day consider the groundwork of popular democratic government.

He weighs monarchy and concludes that, theoretically and in the abstract, it is indeed the most perfect form of government, for it is employed by the Creator of the Universe. Monarchy, in the hands of God, who combines in Himself all the qualifications of an ideal ruler, is indeed a perfect system; in the hands of imperfect man, it is exposed to many defects and abuses. "On account of the corruption of human nature," the Cardinal says, "we consider as more useful for men at this time a monarchy tempered with aristocracy and democracy, rather than simple monarchy." In Bellarmine's time simple monarchy meant un-

limited, absolute, unchecked, autocratic power, held by one powerful ruler, by presumed divine and incontestable right.

Analyzing aristocracy, he accredits it also with being a good form of government, for it proposes to distribute the various and manifold duties of government among the best men of the land. Aristocracy as applied in the feudal system had defended Europe against invasion from abroad and the arrogance of kings at home. On the other hand, it had its defects. The feuds, dissensions, factions, and disturbances incident to an aristocracy, oligarchy, or plutocracy had proved most detrimental to the progress and well-being of that society. It led to division and dissipation of power; it lacked harmony and co-operation, strength and endurance.

Democracy, too, the Cardinal declares a good form of government, but pure and simple democracy would lead to mob violence and the worst form of tyranny. He quotes Plato as saying, "Who can be happy living under the arbitrary will of the crowd."

Bellarmine would not wholely discard any of these systems, however, on account of their defects but wisely and logically he concludes that a combination of what is best in these simple forms would produce a government of the greatest number of desirable qualities, conducive to the best interests of men. To be accurate, he does not term this government a monarchy nor an aristocracy nor a democracy, but a *more useful* form of government. From the monarchic element he would adopt and embody into this mixed form of government enough to insure order, peace, strength, endurance and efficiency. From the aristocratic form he would borrow such ideas as seem fitted to supply many of the natural limitations of a one-man rule. Since it is impossible for one man to superintend all parts of the state and to perform all duties, to have all knowledge, all prudence, all wisdom, all foresight, all counsel and best judgment, a distribution of power, which the Cardinal elsewhere defines as legislative, judical, and executive, is most advantageous. It is interesting to note how often the political ideas of this man 300 years ago coincide with the constitution and the principle of our own American government based upon federal and states' rights.

From the element of democracy he adopts so much which he fuses into this more useful form of government, that his political philosophy presents all those fundamental principles which to-day are basic in democratic government. "If the supreme head," he continues, "and the minor heads acquire office not by hereditary succession, but by consent of the people, then democracy, too, has found its representation in this mixed form of government." Such was the ideal of good government proposed and defended by this illustrious Cardinal of the Church at a time when absolute monarchy was clamoring for universal adoption.

HIS THEORY OF POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY.

It is universally conceded by historians that, in medieval political theory, the authority of a civil ruler was generally founded in the election or recognition of the community. Otto Gierke, a prominent non-Catholic historian, states that "an ancient and generally entertained opinion regarded the will of the people as the source of temporal power; that political power by divine grant (and absolute power) was wholly foreign to the Middle Ages" (Pol. Ther. of the M.A.). Dr. A. J. Carlyle asserts that this fact needs no serious demonstration. "That to the reformation was in some sort due the prevalence of the notion of the Divine Right of Kings," says Figgis in his "Divine Right of Kings," "is generally admitted." Luther denied any limitation of political power, either by Pope or people, nor can it be said that he showed any sympathy for representative institutions" (FIGGIS, *Camb. Mod. Hist.*).

The medieval traditional view as expounded and defended by Cardinal Bellarmine was in substance the following: The nation is an organic political unit composed of individuals. Each individual is by nature born free and equal. Being free and equal, there is no reason why one man should have a greater right to rule than another; still, society is of such a nature that it inherently needs a ruler for the common welfare. The right then to some kind of good government,—the necessity of a sovereign power, is concomitant with society; it is an attribute of society and of the state; it is therefore of divine origin; it does not depend upon the consent, compact, or contract of any indi-

viduals in that society. Who in particular from among these equals shall be vested with this power; which form of government shall be the accepted one?—this the nature and constitution of society does not define; this is a matter to be determined by the choice or consent of the people as a political body. To quote the Cardinal more literally: "First it is to be observed that political power, considered in general and without entering into the question of monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy proceeds from God alone; for it is necessarily annexed to human nature and emanates from Him who made that nature. This power exists by the natural law and does not depend upon the consent of men; for, whether they will or not, they must be governed by someone. Society is a multitude with order, not a crowd with confusion. Order is but a series of inferiors and superiors. Leaders are therefore necessary if society would thrive." This is what St. Paul wished to express when he said: "Who resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God." Here the Cardinal refutes the theory which asserts that sovereignty is created in the first instance, by the contribution of each individual's presumed sovereignty, by social compact or contract, tacit or expressed, as was maintained by Bodin or Althusius, Grotius, Hooker, Hobbes, Locke, Rosseau, Puffendorf, Kant, or Fichte, with slight variation of doctrine. "Government includes powers which never belonged to the individual and which consequently he could never have conferred upon society. Government therefore maintains its full dignity; it is of divine origin"; "there is no power but from God, and those that are, are ordained of God." The next step in Ballarmine's theory explains with whom God, in the first instance has deposited this supreme power. "Political power," he explains, "resides immediately in the whole multitude as an organic unit. The divine law has not given this power to any particular man; therefore it has given it to the multitude. There being no positive law to this effect, there is no more reason why, among equals, one should have a greater right to rule than another. Therefore the power belongs to the whole multitude."

The next question that presents itself is: how shall society or the "multitude" use this power? "The community," he says, "being unable to exercise this power itself, is obliged to com-

municate it to one or to several. In this manner the power of princes considered in general, is indeed by natural and divine law, but, that this or that particular person rule is determined by the choice of society. Particular forms of government are also determined by the law of nations, not by the divine law, for it depends upon the consent of the multitude to place over themselves a king, consul, or other magistrate."

He strengthens his arguments by several examples from Holy Scripture. He quotes Samuel as saying to the people: "Come let us go to Galgal, and let us renew the kingdom, and all the people went to Galgal and there they made Saul king before the Lord and all the people rejoiced exceedingly." Again he says: "God indeed made David king, as he had promised, but by means of the consent of the people. If, therefore, those whom God designates and makes kings, He does not so make without the consent of the people, certainly other rulers chosen in their ways cannot be said to receive their political power immediately from God."

CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATION.

Another mediaeval tradition, which monarchs and the divine right theorists were discarding in the days of Bellarmine was the limitation of royal power. "Constitutional limitation was a medieval tradition," says Carlton J. H. Hayes in his "Political and Social History of Modern Europe." Cardinal Bellarmine's contention, that civil authority was constituted by popular consent, involved *another great democratic principle*, viz., the right of the *community to limit and qualify* the EXERCISE of sovereign power. If the community has the right, was in substance his argument, to confer the whole of political power upon any particular individual, why has it not a right also to that which is less, viz., to place conditions under which this transfer is to be made. Considerable controversy centered also around the origin of law at this time. Divine right theorists contended that there could be no permanent, uniform, universal law or constitution independent of the law-giver. Bellarmine maintained that if a people be ruled by the judgment of a king it will be necessary to have the very best kings at all times; if it be ruled by laws it will suffice

that at one time, at least, there were wise and good kings. Good laws once made, remain; a good king will die. Laws are the combined judgment and experience of several wise men; the king's command is the judgment of one man and it may be rash. Legislators are less exposed to favoritism or bias; a ruler might be influenced by friends, relatives, bribes, or fear. A government by law remains constant for a considerable time; the mind of an individual may change easily and frequently. Government by law may be reduced to an art; by a monarch it may lead to despotism.

Other democratic principles that flow from the origin of sovereignty by consent of the people are: (1) the right to determine or change the form and structure of government; (2) the right of resistance under certain conditions and limitations; (3) the right, finally, of deposing a despot when the application of all peaceful measures have failed. On this subject Cardinal Bellarmine says: "Particular forms of government exist by the law of nations; they are not determined by the divine law because it depends on the consent of the multitude to place over itself a king, consul, or other magistrate, and for a legitimate reason, they can change royalty into aristocracy or democracy, or vice versa, as it was done in Rome." At first the Roman city state had kings; then the people did away with kings and yearly created magistrates. As the rule of kings, so that of consuls was considered just, because it so pleased the people. In other words, each people or nation has the right to choose for itself the particular form of government most suitable to its needs and desires. It was this same principle which President Wilson enunciated in his "Fourteen Points," in which he referred to the rights of small nations to choose their own form of government.

In unfaltering terms the Cardinal defines the obligations of kings and lays down the principles of civil and religious liberty, of human dignity and equality. "Kings," he declares, "will profit much to remember that the people over whom they rule are of the same kind and quality as they themselves. It is possible that not a few of their subjects be more prudent, more capable, and more worthy of the crown than they themselves. Kings must not grow insolent nor condemn private men; should carry their scepter, not in pride, but as a cross." "Men

are born equal in their fundamental nature and as human beings. No man has a right to dominate or tyrannize his fellowman. Man dominates over beasts by despotic rule; his fellow man he merely governs or directs politically." He quotes St. Augustine as saying: " King—rex is derived from regere dirigere—to direct, to counsel; not from regnare or dominare—to dominate or lord over with an air of proprietorship. To be ruled by a superior is not contrary to human dignity and equality. Among the angels there is a hierarchy of order; some precede, some follow, why not among men? There is a difference between political and servile subjection. In servile subjection, one works for another; in political subjection, one works for himself. The servant is ruled for the benefit of the master; the citizen for his own benefit. In a political organization the presiding officer is more servant than subject."

"Human liberty," he says, "consists in this that one is able to choose the good and reject the evil. A just law does not curtail liberty; for it prohibits not the choosing of good and the rejection of evil, but it rather promotes the exercise of this power. Rulers have obligations to each other also. The strong should respect the rights of the weak. Monarchs who take advantage of a weaker nation act not as men but as beasts. In the animal world, strength prevails over weakness; the lion, by some right of his own, kills the wolf; the wolf devours the sheep; the sheep eats the herb. But men, endowed with human reason, are born free and can not be subjected one to the other except by just titles." (*De officiis Principum*, Ch. 21. Another principle embodied in Wilson's Fourteen Points).

While the Church does not find it necessary to proclaim any particular form of government as the most desirable, and while she co-operates with any good government, the political philosophy of Cardinal Bellarmine reflects in most instances the general mind of the Catholic Church and *his* is the opinion of the majority and of the best Catholic theologians and political thinkers. The remote cause of the French Revolution was not the theory of popular sovereignty as expounded by Bellarmine and his associates, but rather the theory of the divine right of kings. "Bad kings help us to revolution," says Emerson, "if only they are bad enough." It is worthy of note, in conclusion, how literally

the political thoughts of this great Cardinal of the Catholic Church have been translated into our American Constitution. Mr. Gailard Hunt, of the Library of Congress, declares that Thomas Jefferson possessed in his library a copy of Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha* written in defense of James I. On the first page Filmer epitomized the political doctrines of Bellarmine and then refuted them. It seems very plausible that Jefferson, if he read but the first page of Patriarcha, thus derived from Cardinal Bellarmine the wording and thoughts of a number of clauses embodied in the Declaration of Independence. Prof. Alfred O'Rahilly states that "the Declaration of Independence is an accurate transcript of the Catholic mind." (*Studies*, March 1918). A comparison of a few excerpts from Cardinal Bellarmine's utterances, from the Virginia Bill of rights, and from the American Declaration of Independence will reveal striking similarity.

Bellarmine: "In a commonwealth all men are born *naturally free* and *equal*." *De Clericis*, Cr. VII.

Vir. Bill R: "All men are by nature *equally free* and independent."

Declaration of Independence: "All men are created *equal*."

Bellarmine: "Government emanates from God; it depends upon the *consent of men* to place over themselves a king, consul, or magistrate." *De Laicis*, Cr. VI.

Vir. Bill R: "All power belongs to the *people*."

Declaration of Independence: "Men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—to secure these rights governments are instituted among men; deriving their just power from the *consent of the governed*."

Bellarmine: "For a legitimate reason the people *can change* the government to an aristocracy or a democracy, or vice versa." *De Laicis*, Ch. VI.

Vir. Bill of R: "Government is instituted for the common benefit and when it fails to confer common benefit a majority of the people have a right to change it."

Declaration of Independence: "When any form of government becomes destructive, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute a new government."

The general conclusion is that the all-pervading idea in Cardinal Bellarmine's Political Philosophy was one of popular gov-

ernment. He defended the world against the encroachments of absolute monarchs; he warned against the anarchistic tendency of social compact theories. He encouraged obedience without servility; he upheld authority without tyranny; liberty without license; participation in government without anarchy. He defended the principles which a few centuries later were embodied in all modern refined and well-organized democratic governments.

JOHN C. RAGER, S.T.L.

THE FORMULA OF BAPTISM IN THE EARLY CHURCH[1]

The object of this paper is to review the case for the existence of the trinitarian formula of baptism before the fourth century, when the earliest quotations of the formula make their appearance, from the historical point of view. The dogmatic aspect of the question is not under discussion. The living voice of the Teaching Church is the ultimate criterion of what is or is not required for valid baptism. It is independent of historical sources, which are exposed to error and destruction, and do not necessarily contain the entire deposit of faith.

In recent years the existence of the formula of baptism as we understand it to-day has repeatedly been called into question for the early Church. Dom de Puniet in his valuable treatise on baptism propounds the hypothesis that in some parts of the Church the interrogations of faith may have taken the place of the formula of baptism in the first centuries of the Church.[2] He bases this hypothesis on the absence of the formula in the ritual of baptism as contained in the anonymous treatise De Sacramentis of the fourth century, in the Egyptian and Ethiopian Church Ordinances, the Arabian Canons of Hippolytus, the Testament of Our Lord, and on numerous statements of the Fathers, who speak of baptism by the creed (symbolo baptizare), of the interrogations of faith as being commanded by Christ in Matthew 28, 19, and of determining the validity of heretical baptism, or of baptism of which the validity was doubtful for certain other reasons, by the trinitarian orthodoxy of the creed upon which it had been administered.[3] In these views de Puniet was followed by M. J. Metzger.[4] This writer, however, goes a step further when he says that up to the present time writers on

---

[1] Paper read at Fourth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Columbus, O., Dec. 26-29, 1923.

Note. CB abbreviates *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.* Leipzig 1897 ff. CV abbreviates *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.* Vienna 1866 ff.

[2] In CABROL'S *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie* (Paris 1910) II, 1, 251-346.

[3] In CABROL II, 1, 340-344.

[4] *Zwei karolingische Pontifikalien vom Oberrhein.* Freiburg 1914.

dogmatics have appealed without reason to all texts mentioning baptism in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost in proof of the existence of the formula of baptism in that early time. He concludes by saying that since these texts are not a valid source of proof for this thesis, and that since the Fathers repeatedly speak of the confession of faith as being prescribed in Matthew 28, 19, there is no proof whatever of the existence of the present formula of baptism in the first five centuries of the Church.[5] The same line of argument was taken up again by Wilhelm Tosetti,[6] who appeals to the first Apology of St. Justin, ch. 61, to Tertullian De Baptismo, ch. 13, and to others, and infers in terms more sweeping than his predecessors that "the trinitarian formula of baptism in our sense was unknown (fremd) to the ancient Church."[7]

Though it is impossible to offer an apodictic historical proof of the existence of the present formula of baptism in the first three centuries of the Church on the basis of the evidence which has been preserved to us from this period, yet the preponderance of historical evidence is in favor of the conservative view that a formula of baptism substantially identical with the present formula was in use from the beginning of the Church.

The texts which are usually quoted from early Christian literature in proof of the existence of the trinitarian formula of baptism in the ancient Church may be divided for convenience into several groups.

The first group comprises those texts which require baptism "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," or "in the name of the Trinity," or "in the Trinity." The instruction for administering baptism in the seventh chapter of the Didache, the oldest of this group of texts and together with the thirteenth chapter of Tertullian, de Baptismo, the classic of this series, is as follows: "Concerning baptism, baptise thus: Having first rehearsed all these things, baptise in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in running water; but if thou hast no running water, baptise in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast

[5] *Op. cit.* p. 166.
[6] *Der heilige Geist als goettliche Person in den Evangelien.* Dusseldorf, 1918.
[7] *Op. cit.* p. 66.

neither, pour water three times on the head in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost." This passage evidently quotes Matthew 28, 19, and the exegesis of his words both in the gospel and in the Didache must, therefore, be the same. The phrase "in the name" has been variously understood: 1) Suarez says its meaning is that baptism must be administered "nominando et voce ipsa invocando Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum."[8] 2) Others interpret it as meaning "by authority of."[9] 3) Others again say that it signifies the unity of the divine nature.[10] 4) Still others, more recently and correctly, assert that it signifies the establishment of a state of juridical dependence from the person mentioned and consecration to this person.[11] For according to Semitic usage the name of a person revealed the nature of the bearer, as the change and interpretation of personal names in the Scriptures show. Whichever interpretation be adopted, if the phrase "in the name" is considered in Matthew 29, 19, apart from the practical and doctrinal implications which the Church enlightened by the Holy Ghost finds in it, or if it is considered in the light of the Didache quoting it, in neither case does it imply the use of a formula for the administration of baptism. This is now commonly admitted by Catholic theologians for Matthew 28, 19.[12] From this it follows that the same interpretation must apply to the Didache, for there is nothing in the immediate context nor in the general historical setting which allows the inference that these words must be spoken when the sacrament is administered.

De Baptismo, chapter 2, contains another allusion to the words spoken during the act of baptism, where Tertulian says that pagans consider it incredible that one can obtain eternal

---

[8] In *III partem* S. Th. q. 66, a. 6, *Disp.* 21, *sec.* 3, *no.* 4; ed. Vives, Paris, 1877, vol. 20, p. 355.

[9] Authors quoted by *St. Alphonsus, Theologia Moralis*, ed. Gaume, Rome, 1907, Vol. III, p. 95, No. 112.

[10] SUAREZ, In *III Partem S. Th.*, q. 66, d. 21, sect. 3, No. 8; Vol. 20, p. 357.

[11] KNABENBAUER, *Commentarius* in *Ev. sec. Matth.* vol. 2, p. 563, Paris 1893; BUCHBERGER in *Kirchliches Handlexikon* II, 2307, Munich 1912; PRAT, *La Theologie de S. Paul*, 3 ed. vol. II, p. 401, Paris 1913; DEISSMANN, *Licht vom Osten*, 3 ed. p. 86, Tuebingen 1909; PREUSCHEN, *Handwoerterbuch z. d. Schriften* d. NT. 1 ed. p. 907 Giessen 1910.

[12] KNABENBAUER, *l. c.* and authorities cited there; SASSE, *De Sacramentis* I, 207; SCHEEBEN-ATZBERGER IV, 1, 520; TANQUERAY, *Synopsis Theol. Dogm.* III, 276.

life through baptism, because "in such simplicity, without pomp, without unusual preparations, and even without any outlay, man having been placed in the water is baptised with few words (inter pauca verba tinctus)." This text requires light from other sources if it is to furnish proof of the existence of the formula, because Tertullian, De Corona, chapter 3, says that the baptised "while being immersed answered something more than the Lord determined in the gospel." From this it is certain that the baptisand answered the interrogation of faith while in the water, but whether the "few words" refer to anything further, that is, to the formula of baptism, one cannot conclude from the text. Further on, in chapter 6 De Baptismo, we are told that the ablution of sin is obtained through faith pledged in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but these terms, also, are too indefinite to be interpreted of anything but the profession of faith.

In chapter 13, De Baptismo, we encounter another of the texts often invoked to prove the existence of the formula of baptism. Having explained that in earlier times faith without baptism was sufficient for salvation, Tertullian proceeds to prove that since the coming of Christ it is not in itself sufficient: "Lex enim tinguendi imposita est et forma praescripta. Ite, inquit, docete nationes tinguentes eas in nomen Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti." "Forma" here means, not the formula, but the specific kind of baptism, namely, baptism in the Trinity, as the next following sentence in Tertullian's text explains: "Huic legi collata definito illa, nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua Spiritu non intrabit in regnum caelorum, obstrinxit fidem ad baptismi necessitatem." The "definitio" joined to the law is the specification of the kind of baptism required for salvation, namely, baptism in water and the Spirit. This interpretation is in accord with the usage of Tertullian.[13] Finally, Tertullian's statement De Praescriptione Haereticorum, ch. 20, "iussit (apostolos) ire et docere nationes tinguendas in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum," must be considered in the same light as Matthew 28, 19. The command to baptise in the name of the Trinity does not by this very fact enjoin also to pronounce the names of the divine Persons in the act of baptism.

[13] Cf. HOLTZCLAU in *Theologia Wirceburgensis* V, 178, Paris 1853; FRANZELIN, *De Sacramentis in Genere*, 5 ed. p. 37, Rome 1910.

Although baptism is one of the most prominent topics in the correspondence of St. Cyprian, it is remarkable that he never quotes the formula of baptism. He quotes parts of the baptismal creed, writes of the anointing with oil, of the exorcisms, of baptism by aspersion, and affusion of the imposition of hands, the minister, the blessing of the water, and of a curious ceremony which has been interpreted as kissing the foot of the infant baptised;[14] but he does not distinctly quote the words of the formula. He writes that our Lord said the nations are to be baptised in the name of the three divine Persons, and opposes this baptism to that administered in the name of Paul.[15] Baptism is the "sacramentum Trinitatis": Mth. 28, 19 "insinuat Trinitatem, cuius sacramento gentes tinguerentur."[16] Elsewhere heretical baptism conferred in the name of Christ is declared invalid,[17] because the Lord commanded baptism "in plena et adunata Trinitate." If these words are taken as they stand, they do not necessarily imply a formula; all the requirements of the context are satisfied by a profession of orthodox faith in the Trinity, which is Cyprian's main contention throughout. The council of Carthage celebrated under St. Cyprian in the year 256 also dwells on the necessity of administering baptism in the Trinity, because this is the command of the Lord, but makes no mention of complying with this command by means of a spoken formula of baptism.[18]

Origen also derives the necessity of baptism in the Trinity from the command of the Lord: "Being free among the dead, Christ rose in the free and holy number three. In which He also sanctifies us through the washing of water, saying that we must be baptised in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost."[19] "Purification does not take place without the mystery of the Trinity."[20] There is no legitimate baptism except sub nomine Trinitatis.[21] One cannot infer the existence of the formula from these statements.

---

[14] *Ep.* 64, 4. Cf. D'ALES, *Theologie de S. Cyprien*, p. 234, note 2.
[15] *Ep.* 27, 4.
[16] *Ep.* 73, 5.
[17] *Ep.* 73, 17 f.
[18] *Sententiae Episcoporum* 10.
[19] *Frag.* 79 In *Ioh*: CB X, 547; cp. In *Num. Hom*, 12, 2: C B XXX, 100, 14.
[20] In *Lev. Hom.* 8, 11: CB XXIX, 415, 18 f.
[21] Quoted in CABROL and LECLERCQ, *Monumenta Liturgica* I, No. 1514.

Among the remaining evidence of this period in favor of baptism in the name of the Trinity is the letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to Dionysius and Stephan of Rome, in which we read that "those who have been baptised in the name of the three Persons, even though they were baptised by heretics, are not to be rebaptised if these heretics confess the three persons. But those who are converted from other heresies are to receive the baptism of Holy Church."[22] In the apocrypha a narrative in the Acta Petri tells of the apostle descending the side of the ship and baptising Theon "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."[23] The first council of Arles declares that when heretics who have been baptised "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost" are converted, they are not to be rebaptised except in the case that they have not the orthodox trinitarian creed.[24] Hefele understands this of the trinitarian formula of baptism.[25] The Acts of the seven martyrs who suffered at Samosata under Maximian also testify to baptism "in the Trinity."[26]

The texts thus far quoted show that baptism in the Trinity is considered essential for the validity of the Sacrament, but without further evidence to throw light upon them they do not prove the existence of the formula of baptism.

A second group of texts, recording the invocation of the blessed Trinity upon the person baptised, affords a better clue to the existence of the formula. This group begins with the fragment of Irenaeus, No. 35, which reads: "Through the sacred water and the invocation (ἐπικλήσεως) of the Lord we are purified of our former sins."[27] Water and the invocation, therefore, are the cause effecting the remission of sins. It is impossible to identify the invocation with the interrogations of faith. It may be questioned whether in this text the invocation is the formula, for a prayer in behalf of the baptised would sufficiently

---

[22] The authenticity of this letter is doubtful: see HARNACK, *Gesch. d. altchr. Literatur I*, 1, 425.

[23] VOUAUX, *Les Actes de Pierre*, p. 258 (Paris 1922). The Acts of Peter date from the third century: ibid. p. 206; HARNACK II, 1, 553.

[24] ROUTH, *Reliquiae Sacrae* IV, 306 and 308.

[25] Conciliengeschichte, 2 ed. II, 209.

[26] CABROL and LECLERCQ, op. cit. I, 4391, 4396. Also the *Acta Philippi*, ibid. II, 4513, 4519; Acta Mathaei, 4532, 4537; Acta Barnabae, 4545, 4549; *Acta Thaddaei*, 4550; *Liber Adami*, 4887s.

[27] Ed. Stieren, vol. II, p. 846, Lipsiae 1848.

answer the requirements of the text. And yet the fragment of Irenaeus mentions only the invocation of the Lord, seemingly indicating a distinct unit.

St. Justin supplies additional details regarding the invocation of the Trinity: "Those who are convinced and believe in the truth of our teachings and undertake to bring themselves to live accordingly, are taught to pray and fasting to ask of God the remission of their past sins, we praying and fasting with them. Then we take them to a place where there is water, and they are born again in the same way in which we were born again. For in the name (ἐπ' ὀνόματος) of God, the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost they are then bathed in water. For Christ said, "If you are not born again, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."..... From the apostles we learned the following doctrine concerning this matter. Since at our first birth we are born unknowingly and according to necessity,..... and come into the world with careless habits and evil ways, therefore, in order not to remain children of necessity and ignorance, but of free choice and knowledge, the name of God, the Father and Lord of all things, in the water is invoked upon him who chooses to be born again and has repented his sins, the one who conducts the baptisand to baptism pronouncing only this very name. For no one can state the proper name of the ineffable God; but if any one ventured to say that God has a proper name, it would remain incurable madness. This bath is called enlightenment, because the understanding of those who learn these doctrines is enlightened. The enlightened one is bathed also in the name (ἐπ' ὀνόματος) of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Ghost" (I Apol. 61).

In this chapter St. Justin begins by describing baptism as spiritual regeneration, which is effected by bathing the baptisand in water in the name of the Trinity. Christ's command is the origin of this rite. Then follows a comparison of the vitiated nature which man has in virtue of his natural birth, and which is not of his own choice, with the new being which he acquires through baptism. This newly acquired nature opens the way to heaven for him and is obtained through his own free choice. Physical generation is contrasted with spiritual regeneration.

The latter is caused by the invocation of the names of the three divine Persons upon the baptisand standing in the water. As he proceeds to state the names of the three divine Persons, St. Justin stops short after naming the Father at the thought that pagans would be likely to ask the conventional name of the Father, since they were accustomed to designate their gods by conventional names, such as Zeus, Mercury, etc. Anticipating this question, he tells them that the Father has no such conventional name. Then he resumes the thread of his discourse, adding that Christians are baptised also in the name of Christ and of the Holy Ghost. His meaning is, therefore, that the name of Christ and of the Holy Ghost is also invoked upon the baptisand.

From this analysis it results that according to St. Justin baptism consists in immersing the baptisand in water and invoking the names of the three divine Persons upon him. This answers the requirements of a formula. The invocation cannot be interpreted of the interrogations of faith nor of a prayer. St. Justin had no hesitation in describing the Christian rites as we know from his description of the Eucharist, and the character of this chapter shows that he intended a generally complete description of the rite of baptism as to essentials.

Defending the divinity of Christ against Praxeas, Tertullian says, "After His resurrection He promised to send to His disciples the promised of the Father, and in the end commanded that they baptise into the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, not into one. For not once, but thrice we are immersed at the mention of the separate names" (ad singula nomina).[28] These words attest the mention of the three divine Persons at the moment of immersion, and when viewed together with the statement that baptism is conferred "by pronouncing a few words"[29] are valid evidence for the existence of the formula.

Origen also ascribes the regeneration of man in baptism to the invocation of the Trinity. In the treatise De Principiis he says that "the authority and dignity of the Holy Ghost is so great that saving baptism cannot be conferred except by the authority of all the Persons of the most exalted Trinity, that is, through the mention of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost."[30]

---

[28] *Adv. Prax.* 26: CV XLVII, 279, 13 ff.
[29] *De Baptismo* ch. 2.
[30] I, 3, 2: CB XXII, 50, 5 ff.

Elsewhere he says that "those who are cleansed are made clean, not through the first, nor the second invocation, but except the third invocation be pronounced, one cannot be made clean."[31] In the foregoing statements the sacramental efficacy of baptism is ascribed to the invocation of the three divine Persons. In other writings of Origen the invocations are singled out more distinctly than above as a separate unit. Thus in the commentary on the gospel according to St. John we learn that baptism "by its nature is the principle and source of divine gifts to him who puts himself into the hands of the Deity, because of the power of the invocations of the adorable Trinity."[32] Origen is more distinct still, though guarding the sacred words with a tantalizing vagueness, when he says, "When, therefore, anyone takes this oil with which a sanctified one is anointed, that is, the Holy Scripture teaching the administration of baptism in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, changes a few things, performs the anointing, and speaks in a certain way, thou art no longer a catechumen, for thou hast received the washing of regeneration."[33] The scriptural instruction on baptism can hardly be other than Matthew 28, 19. The use of this oil is the application of the teaching of the Scripture on baptism. The few changes and the speaking in a certain way are that use of the instruction which together with the washing of water is baptism. If we view this statement in conjunction with those which declare that the invocations of the Trinity are the essential words of baptism, we have the elements of the formula: the invocations as a distinct, brief unit.

Firmilian writes to St. Cyprian that in receiving heretics into the Church it would be absurd to believe that the inquiry into the orthodoxy of the person who had baptised the convert is to be omitted on the ground that baptism had been conferred through the invocation of the three divine Persons, for in addition to this the true faith is required in the baptiser for the validity of the sacrament. The invocation of the three divine Persons confers the grace of baptism when the baptiser has the

[31] *Hom. in Lev.* VII, 4: CB XXIX, 384, 18 f.
[32] VI, 5: CB X, 142, 29 ff. For the text see SEEBERG, *Dogmengeschichte* 2 ed. I, 436, note 3, Berlin 1908.
[33] In *Ezech. Hom.* VII, 4, quoted by CABROL and LECLERCQ, *Monumenta Liturgica* I, No. 1359.

true faith. Here again the invocation of the Trinity constitutes the essential words of the sacrament.[34]

The narrative of the administration of baptism by a heretical woman in the following chapter does not favor the view that the interrogations of faith are the essential words of baptism, or that the form was unknown. Firmilian says that she used the customary and legitimate words of interrogation, so that she did not seem to deviate in any way from the ordinance of the Church: "baptizaret quoque multos usitata et legitima verba interrogationis usurpans, ut nihil discrepare ab ecclesiastica regula videretur." Firmilian had previously, chapter 9, ascribed the effects of baptism to the invocation of the Trinity, which it is impossible to identify with the interrogations of faith. Since it appears from chapters 9 and 11 that the invocation is the essential part of the words of baptism according to Firmilian's view, his statement that the heretic did not seem to deviate from the ordinance of the Church must be understood in harmony with this view. It cannot be interpreted as excluding the formula, nor as relegating it to a secondary place.

Gregory of Neocaesarea also implies that the invocation of the Trinity constitutes the essential words of baptism. He describes the biblical scene in which Christ asks baptism of St. John as follows: "What manner of prayer shall I pronounce over Thee, Who hearest also the prayers of those who know Thee not? Baptising others, I baptize into Thy name, that they may believe in Thee, Who comest with glory; baptising Thee, of whom shall I make mention? Into whose name shall I baptise Thee? Into that of the Father? But Thou hast the Father completely in Thyself and art entirely in the Father. Into that of the Son? But there is none besides Thee who is by nature the Son of God. Or into that of the Holy Ghost?"[35] The baptism of John is here described as Trinitarian, the words being an invocation of the Trinity.

Taken in conjunction, these texts prove that the essential words of baptism consist in the invocation of the three divine Persons. They stand out as a distinct unit, and cannot be iden-

[34] *Inter Epp. Cypr.* 75, 9: CV III, 815 f.
[35] *Sermo de Theophania*, quoted by CABROL and LECLERCQ, *Monumenta Liturgica I*, 1547.

tified with the interrogations of faith. There is no evidence that they formed part of a prayer; in fact, the Greek names of the invocation (ἐπικαλεῖν ἐπονομάζειν), and the isolated position in which it appears preclude this interpretation. All that is wanting to make this formal evidence of the formula is the express mention of the act of baptism joined with them.

A third group of texts contains quotations of the formula of baptism. The acts of Savinus, bishop of Assisi, who suffered martyrdom in the year 303, quote the formula in these terms: "Et ego te baptizo in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, qui te inluminet in vitam aeternam."[36] The Acts of Claudius of Rome, who suffered in the year 285, give the formula with unessential variants: "Et ego famulus dei et sacerdos baptizo te in aqua in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti in remissionem peccatorum et carnis resurrectionem."[37] These Italian texts are the most ancient quotations of the formula. Their genuinity is acknowledged.[38] The final words in which they differ from the present Roman formula resemble those of the Gallican rite.[39]

Next in the order of time is the evidence of the Apostolic Constitutions, written in Syria toward the close of the fourth century. The formula is not quoted, but the text leaves no doubt that the trinitarian formula was used: "Then thou, O bishop, or a priest acting under thy direction, shalt baptise them in the water, pronouncing over them the holy invocation of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost."[40] Here the formula is a group of words mentioning the names of the three divine Persons, and quite distinct from the other prayers of the rite of baptism; it cannot be understood otherwise than as a formula. The fact that this text alludes to the formula throws light on a later statement that baptism is conferred "in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost."[41] It shows that this phrase implies the use of the formula here and probably elsewhere in early Christian literature. Still later we find the further implication that baptism "in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost,"

---

[36] *Acta SS* April 18, t. 2 Aprilis 1865, p. 538.
[37] *Acta SS* August 23, t. 4 Augusti, p. 571.
[38] HARNACK, *Geschichte d. altchr. Literatur I*, 2, p. 821 f.
[39] FEROTIN, *Le Liber Ordinum* p. 32, Paris 1904.
[40] *Constitutiones Apostolorum* III, 16, 4: ed. FUNK I, 211.
[41] *Ibid.* VI, 15, 1: FUNK I, 337.

and consequently in the mind of the author the use of the formula, is enjoined in Matthew 28, 19.[42]

The formula of baptism is not quoted again until nearly a century later in the so-called Canons of Hippolytus: "Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti."[43]

Finally many heretical sects of this early time possessed a ceremony of baptism which was borrowed from the Christian rite. If it can be shown that they used a formula patterned after the Christian formula, then the existence of the latter is proven for a time preceding the heresy. There is some evidence to establish this line of argument. The Clementines often mention baptism "in the thrice blessed invocation" and "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."[44] This is a direct parallel to the orthodox Christian testimony listed above. St. Irenaeus has preserved the Marcosian formula of baptism, which is hardly more than an imitation of the orthodox formula: "in the name of the unknown father of the universe, in the truth, the mother of all, in him who came down upon Christ: unto unity, redemption, and the community of forces."[45] Here we have a trinity of father, truth, and spirit; the second member probably being equivalent to Christ. In the same chapter Irenaeus quotes another formula which has the trinity of light, spirit, and life. The repeated mention of a trinity of one kind or another in these formulas points to a Christian model when the members parallel the Christian Trinity in the names of these members and certainly allude to them. The Clementine homilies and Recognitions, as already stated, imply the use of the Trinitarian formula. The Elkesaites conferred baptism by means of the formula "In the name of the Father and of the Son."[46] Now we know that heretics were in the habit of copying the Christian rite of baptism, for St. Augustine writes, De Haeresibus, 44, that many heretics took the "regula baptismi" with them when they left the Church, and preserved it. Firmilian narrates the case, already quoted above, of a heretic who copied the entire rite of baptism. We are justified, therefore, in inferring that

---

[42] *Ibid.* VII, 22, 1: FUNK I, 404 f.
[43] Ed. ACHELIS, *Canon* 132: TU VI. 4, p. 97.
[44] E. g. *Hom. XI*, 26; XIII, 4: *Recog. I*, 63; I, 73; III, 67.
[45] *Adv. Haer.* I, 21, 3: ed. STIEREN I, 227.
[46] HIPPOLYTUS, *Adv. Omn. Haer.* IX, 15: CB XXVI, 253, 10.

the existence of these heretical formulas proves the prior existence of the Christian formula of baptism. The heretical formulas, according to the testimony of Irenaeus, are as old as the second century; hence the Christian formula existed prior to this time.

The reasons thus far adduced in testimony of the existence of the formula of baptism are strengthened when the patristic expressions "baptism in the Trinity" and "through the invocation of the Trinity" are read in the light of documents of the late patristic and early scholastic period. There is no doubt that in the late patristic age baptism was conferred by means of the formula. Now the expressions in question are among the received terms used in the late patristic period to designate the administration of baptism by means of the formula in the late patristic period. The inference is legitimate that the same meaning attached to them in the early patristic period. The following examples illustrate the use of these terms at the end of the patristic age. Pelagius I in the letter Ad Gaudentium Ep. (558/560) maintains the necessity of conferring baptism in the name of the Trinity: "Evangelicum vero praeceptum, ipso domino et salvatore nostro Iesu Christo tradente, nos admonet in nomine Trinitatis .... baptismum unicuique tribuere, dicente domino nostro Iesu Christo discipulis suis, Ite, baptizate omnes gentes in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti." Zachary I in the letter Virgilius (746) asserts the validity of heretical baptism: "Quicumque baptizatus fuerit ab haereticis in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti nullo modo debet rebaptizari."[47] Two years later in the letter Sacris Liminibus he writes that there is no substitute for baptism: "Quicumque sine invocatione trinitatis lotus fuisset, sacramentum regenerationis non haberet." The "invocatio" is then identified with the "nominatio" of the three divine Persons. Shortly afterwards Stephan I, ep. Inter Dicta (754), says of heretical baptism: "Quia in nomine sanctae trinitatis sunt baptizati, in eo permaneant baptismo." Similarly the fourth Lateran Council describes baptism as "Sacramentum....quod ad dei invocationem et individuae trinitatis, videlicet patris et filii et spiritus sancti, consecratur." The

[47] Cf. INNOCENT I, ep. *Esti Tibi*, Feb. 15, 404: CJC *Fontes* I, 16; ep. *Magna me gratulatio*, Dec. 13, 414: CJC *Fontes* I. 18.

schoolmen also were familiar with this use of the terms: Peter Lombard uses "invocatio trinitatis" and "forma baptismi" in the identical sense,[48] and the MS 208 (saec. 12) of Monte Cassino identifies the "verba sacramenti" with the "invocatio Trinitatis."[49] These documents extending over a period of six centuries show that baptism "in the Trinity" and "through the invocation of the Trinity" was baptism administered by means of the Trinitarian formula.

If these documents appear of doubtful value to prove early patristic usage because of the long span of time which separates them from the evidence which they are intended to corroborate and clarify, there is to be set over against this doubt the conservative character of theological terms in ecclesiastical usage, which change very slowly and only when imperative grounds commend a change, and the historical continuity of the language of the Church, which in later times resets the non-technical expressions of the Fathers in the formulas of science without any change of meaning. Now the period from which these documents are quoted was eminently a conservative age, in which the struggle to preserve the faith and the civilization of the forefathers absorbed all the energies of the Christian mind. There was no time to formulate new problems, nor did such present themselves to peoples who were strained to the utmost in the attempt to save the spiritual and intellectual values of the past. A new theological terminology was not evolved in this period.

The Trinitarian formula is the only one which has ever been sanctioned by the Church. It is found in all rituals and official documents which mention a formula. The Responsio ad Consulta Bulgarorum of Pope Nicholas I is only an apparent exception. The case put before the pope was the question as to the validity of baptism administered by a Jew of whom it was not known whether he was a Christian or a pagan. The pope's reply that the baptism was valid if conferred in the name of the Trinity, or only in the name of Christ, has been construed as

---

[48] IV *Sent.* d. 3, c. 2. According to scholastic usage "forma" signifies not only the words of the formula as such, but especially their specifying function of conferring the sacramental nature upon the rite, after the analogy of the Aristotelean theory of the constitution of bodies. Cf. S. TH. III, q. 60, a. 7.

[49] Text in GRABMANN, *Geschichte d. scholastischen Methode* II, 306.

acknowledging the validity of a formula in which only the name of Christ is pronounced. The context of the document, however, proves that the pope required faith in the Trinity or at least in Christ for the validity of the baptism; he said nothing of the formula. This is clear from the authorities he cites for his decision: Acts 2, 38 and 19, 5; St. Ambrose, De Spiritu Sancto; and St. Augustine, De Baptismo 6, 25. In chapter 15 of the same document he had already declared that only baptism in the name of the Trinity is valid.

It is quite generally admitted now that baptism in the name of Christ, frequently mentioned in the Fathers and also in the New Testament, is Christian baptism as distinguished from that of Jews and heretics. But it is an open question whether baptism was administered in isolated cases or localities by mentioning only the name of Christ in the formula. Such is the evidence of the anonymous treatise De Rebaptismate.[50] The validity of baptism conferred only in the name of Christ is also defended by some of the schoolmen.[51] The Church had long before made plain her position regarding this form of baptism. The council of Nice (325) declared that only those heretics who have been baptised in the name of the Trinity are not to be rebaptised (canon 8); the council of Arles (314) had previously taken the same position (canon 8). Pope Pelagius I (Ep. Ad Gaudentium Episcopum, 558/560) required rebaptism of heretics who had been baptised in the name of the Lord, but not of those who had received baptism in the name of the Trinity.

The Church derives the necessity of the Trinitarian formula of baptism from the Lord's command to baptise in Matthew 28, 19. Thus when St. Boniface wrote to Pope Zachary I regarding the opinion that one may become a Christian through the imposition of hands by the bishop without the invocation and ablution of baptism, the pope rejected this opinion, saying, "Quis enim nisi baptizetur iuxta praeceptum Domini in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti et sic per manus impositionem consecretur poest esse catholicus?"[52] There is no precept of the Lord to this effect except Matthew 28, 19.

---

[50] Ch. 5-7: CV III, 3 p. 74 ff. Similar testimony is found in the *Acta Quirini* and the epurious *Acta Papae Marcelli.*

[51] E. g. HUGH OF ST. VICTOR, *De Sacr.* II, 2, 1; PETER LOMBARD, IV Sent. 3, 3 f.

[52] Ep. *Sacris Liminibus,* May 1, 748.

In a similar strain Pelagius I wrote to Gaudentius: "Sin vero .... manifesta confessione claruerit, quod in nomine Trinitatis fuerint baptizati, sola reconciliationis gratia impensa catholicae fidei sociare maturabis, ut .... nihil aliter quam quod iubet evangelica auctoritas .... videatur effectum. .... Evangelicum vero praeceptum, ipso domino et salvatore nostro tradente, nos admonet in nomine trinitatis, trina eiam mersione, sanctum baptisma unicuique tribuere, dicente domino nostro Iesu Christo discipulis suis, Ite, baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti." Here again the pope says that Christ commanded baptism in the name of the Trinity, which he opposes to baptism in the name of Christ alone. This is true only if the words of Christ in the gospel require the invocation of the three divine persons in the act of baptism.

Innocent III, Ep. ad Thoriam Nidrosiensem (1206), writes in the same sense: "Cum in baptismo duo semper, videlicet verbum et elementum, necessario requirantur, iuxta quod de verbo Veritas ait, 'Euntes in mundum universum, praedicate evangelium omni creaturae et baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti,' eadem dicat de elemento, 'Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto non intrabit in regnum caelorum,' dubitare non debes, illos verum non habere baptismum, in quibus non solum utrumque praedictorum, sed eorum alterum est omissum." In these words Innocent says that the "verbum," or formula, is essential to baptism, and that the proof of this fact lies in Matthew 28, 19.

The Fides Nicephori (811), which was addressed to Pope Leo III and approved by him, though it is not an ecclesiastical document, is valuable in this connection because it was accepted by the pope. In it the patriarch professes, "I confess also one baptism unto remission of sins conferred in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost according to the evangelical and divine tradition."[53] The evangelical tradition according to which baptism must be conferred in the name of the Trinity is found only in Matthew 28, 19.

The use of the Trinitarian formula and the verbal expression of the act of baptism is insisted upon in later documents of the Church. Alexander III declares that baptism conferred without

[53] Quoted in CAVALLERA, *Thesaurus Doctrinae Catholicae*, No. 1001 f.

the words "Ego te baptizo," and using only the invocation of the Trinity is invalid.[54] Alexander VIII condemns the opinion that baptism conferred in this way was formerly valid.[55] In the decree for the Armenians (1439) Eugene IV states that the formula of baptism is "Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti," but he acknowledges also the validity of the following forms: "Baptizatur talis servus dei in nomine, etc.," and "Baptizatur manibus meis talis in nomine, etc." He proceeds to prove the validity of these forms as follows: "Cum principalis causa, ex qua baptismus virtutem habet, sit Sancta Trinitas, instrumentalis autem sit minister, qui tradit exterius sacramentum: si exprimitur actus, qui per ipsum exercetur ministrum, cum Sanctae Trinitatis invocatione, perficitur sacramentum."[56] It will be noted that Pope Eugene requires the verbal expression of the act of baptism, as did his predecessors Alexander III and VIII. The teaching of Pope Eugene was confirmed by Leo X in 1521 and by Clement VII in 1526.

The omission of the formula of baptism in liturgical books and in the writings of the Fathers and expressions such as "symbolo baptizare"[57] constitute another chain of evidence on which the hypothesis of the administration of baptism through the creed or the interrogations of faith is based. If this series of proofs were to hold, there could be no doubt that on the one hand baptism was administered by means of the formula in many parts of Christendom, and on the other hand that the formula was not in use elsewhere, not even by St. Augustine. For it is plain that all those who testify to the administration of baptism through the invocation of the Trinity consider the formula essential to the validity of the sacrament. The invocation of the Trinity cannot be interpreted of the creed nor of the interrogations of faith.

The argument constructed on the omission of the formula and on such phrases as "symbolo baptizare" is an argument of silence, which is valid only when it is equivalent to the assertion that the formula did not exist. Errors regarding the formula

---

[54] *Ep. ad Poptium Episc. Clarmont*, 1159/1181: DENZINGER, 398.
[55] *Prop. Damn.* Aug. 24, 1690, No. 27: DENZ. 1317.
[56] DENZ. 696.
[57] See e. g. *Cypr. ep. LXIX*, 7: CV III, 756, 7-13; S. AUG., *De Bapt.* VI, 25, 47: CV LI, 324, 8 f.

may have been made by individuals, but if we weigh the omission of the formula in certain writings and the use of ambiguous terms in others according to the accepted criterion of the value of the argument of silence, these items of evidence are not found equivalent to the denial of the existence of the formula. The phrases which seem to imply the substitution of the creed for the formula merely indicate that the creed was the criterion by which the validity of baptism was determined in doubtful cases, since the creed and the formula corresponded, or that the minister of the sacrament was at pains to ascertain whether the person to be baptised had a sufficient knowledge of the faith, or that he imparted this knowledge by explaining the creed just before the baptism of necessity. This explains not only such phrases as "symbolo baptizare," but also the case narrated by Dionysius of Alexandria in Eusebius.[58]

Firmilian's statements are more difficult to explain. He says of a certain heretic: "baptizavit multos usitata et legitima verba interrogationis usurpans, ut nihil discrepare ab ecclesiastica regula videretur. .... potest credi aut remissio peccatorum data aut lavacri salutaris regeneratio rite perfecta, ubi omnia quamvis ad imaginem veritatis tamen per daemonem gesta sunt?"[59] The formula is not excluded here, but passed over in silence, for the controversy bore only on the orthodox faith of the minister of the sacrament. When Firmilian says that "all things were done in the image of truth," he refers to the interrogations of faith which he had just mentioned. He alludes to the formula in chapter 9 of the same letter, when he says that even if baptism has been conferred through the invocation of the Trinity, it is invalid if the minister has not the true faith. Neither the creed nor the interrogations of faith can be described as an invocation.

Neither does the omission of the formula in liturgical books offer inexplicable difficulties. In the Gelasian Sacramentary, for instance, the prayers for the blessing of the baptismal water on Holy Saturday are given, and in the rite of baptism the questions of faith are followed by the rubric, "Deinde per singulas vices mergis eum tertio in aqua," but of the formula nothing is

[58] *Hist. Eccl.* VII, 9: CB IX, 2, 646.
[59] *Inter epp. Cypr.* LXXV, 11: CV III, 818, 8.

said.[60] If the omission of the formula proved that it did not exist, one would be compelled also to conclude that the words of the consecration were not a part of the canon of the mass, since many of the old sacramentaries do not contain them. This is an impossible position. They were not written lest they fall under the gaze of profane eyes; their fixed character and the fact that they were well known made it unnecessary to commit them to writing.[61] The same explanation holds for the omission of the formula of baptism in these books.

The above instances are typical of the two classes of arguments advanced against the existence of the formula of baptism in the early centuries of the Church. It is believed that the solutions here indicated in principle show the lines along which similar arguments fairly may be refuted.

In conclusion it is natural to raise the question why there is so little evidence in the literature of the first three centuries to prove the existence of the formula of baptism. It may be said in reply that an important part of this literature is lost to us: we have none of the earliest rituals. Considering the wide diffusion of Christianity, it seems natural to assume their existence; and if one considers the Didache and St. Justin, there was no hesitation in the beginning to commit the liturgy to writing. But the lowering clouds of persecution toward the close of the second century brought into practise the adage, "Sit codex vester memoria." The controversy on the baptism of heretics bore on the faith of the minister, not directly on the formula, so that the latter was alluded to only in passing. From the second century pagans manifested a predilection for caricaturing the rite of baptism on the stage and in other mock rites.[62] It was only natural, therefore, that baptism should be concealed from scoffers and mimics. Even though the discipline of the secret was not a law, and though pagans had no difficulty in obtaining knowledge of Christian rites through apostates, through official inspection, and through bona fide inquiry, the words of the Fathers cannot be otherwise explained than as an endeavor to pre-

---

[60] Ed. WILSON, p. 86, Oxford 1894.

[61] Cf. FEROTIN, *Le Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum*, p. XXV, Paris 1912.

[62] ST. JUSTIN, *Apol.* I, 62; TERT. *De Praescr. Haer.* 40; SMITH in HASTINGS' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, IV, 907.

vent pagans from acquiring knowledge of them. How else is Origen to be understood when he says, "Therefore we have been received by Christ, and our house has been made clean of our former sins and adorned with the ornaments of the mysteries of the faithful, which are known to the initiated?"[63] The reference is to baptism and to the other sacraments which were received together with baptism; the knowledge of these things is reserved to the faithful. The following sentence of Origen is even more distinct: "But if you have also come to the spring of baptism and have received amid the priests and levites those venerable and admirable sacraments which are known to those who have a right to know them, then having crossed the Jordan through the ministry of the priests, you will enter the promised land, in which Jesus succeeding Moses will receive you and be to you a guide on a new journey."[64] Christians have a right to know baptism and the other sacraments which were administered together with it; others have not this right.

Christian graves tell a similar tale. Making due allowance for the sententious brevity of sculptured inscriptions and for the conciseness of conversational language so often appearing in them, the laconic vagueness with which they allude to the sacraments remains to be explained. If these inscriptions were not intended solely for the eyes of the initiated, it would have been more natural to omit them altogether than to write indefinite and to a pagan quite meaningless words, such as "accepit" and "percepit," which repeatedly designate baptism.[65]

The same reticence is observed by the popes in official documents. Cornelius I (251-253), writing to Bishop Fabian of Antioch regarding the baptism of Novatus, mentions it only in the terms "perfusus accepit."[66] Innocent I (401-417) in a letter to Bishop Decentius concerning the sacrament of confirmation says that he cannot write the words, or formula of the sacrament, "ne magis prodere videar quam ad consultationem respondere."[67]

---

[63] *In Exod. Hom. VIII*, 4: CB XXIX, 225, 17-19.
[64] In *L. Iesu Nave Hom. IV*, 1: CB XXX, 309, 7 ff.
[65] GROSSI GONDI, I *Monumenti Cristiani Dei Primi Sei Secoli*, Vol. I, p. 98 and 234, Rome 1920.
[66] EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* VI, 43, 14: CB IX, 2, 620, 7.
[67] DENZINGER, 98.

Epiphanius blames the Marcionites for celebrating the holy mysteries in the presence of the catechumens.[68] The words of consecration in mass were not committed to writing.[69]

Much further testimony might be adduced to prove that Christian doctrines and rites were withheld from pagan eyes and ears.

LEO F. MILLER, D.D.,
Columbus, Ohio.

---

[68] PANARION XLII, 3: CB XXXI, 98, 1 f.
[69] HATCH, *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages Upon the Christian Church*, p. 302, London 1914.

THE BELIEF IN THE CONTINUITY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE AMONG THE FRANKS OF THE FIFTH AND SIXTH CENTURIES

The Roman poets of the Augustan Age had pointed with pride to the illimitable extent and the eternal duration of the Empire,[1] and since the days of Hadrian the words "Roma aeterna" were officially inscribed on the coins.[2] Some of the Christian writers of a later time were no less fascinated by the majesty of Rome.[3] Amidst all the terrors of the barbarian inroads Claudian breaks forth into the words:

Nec terminus unquam Romanae dicionis erit.[4]

Most Christian writers, however, impressed by the decadence of the ancient "virtus Romana" and by the successive misfortunes by which the Empire was overwhelmed, did not share the systematic optimism of the pagan Romans.[5] But even they saw in Rome the last of the great world-powers which was only to be destroyed when the world itself went up in flames.[6] The interpretation of certain biblical texts[7] had given rise to the opinion that the end of the Empire, the appearance of the Antichrist and the destruction of all things would be most intimately united. During the invasions the Romans preferred to seek for consolation and inspiration in the pages of Daniel, in the famous dream-vision of the four World-Monarchies: "But in the days of those kingdoms the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and it shall break in pieces and

---

[1] Aen. 1, 278 sq.: His ego (sc. Romanis) nec metas rerum nec tempora pono, Imperium sine fine dedi. *Tib.* 2, 5v; 23 sq.

[2] GRAUERT, Rom und Günther der Eremit, *Hist. Jahrbuch* 19, 2, (1898).

[3] Cf. PAULINUS OF NOLA, *ep. ad Pammachium*, no. 15, (Migne P. L. 61. sp. 213.).

[4] *Carmen* 24, v. 159 sq. (Loeb Classics, vol. 2, p. 54).

[5] COMMODIANUS, *Carmen Apol.* v. 923 (ed. Dombart, p. 175): Luget in aeternum, quae se pactabat aeterna; JUVENCUS, *Hist. Evang.* (v. 1, ed. Huemer, p. 1):

Immortale nihil mundi compage tenetur
Non orbis, non regna hominum, non aurea Roma.

[6] LACT., *Inst. Div.* 7, 14 and 15 (ed. Brandt,CSEL. vol. 19, p. 627); AMBROSIUS, *Expos. in Lucam* 10, 10 (ed. Ballerini Milan, 1877, vol. 3, p. 303); *Hilarius contra Auxentium*, 5 (Migne, P. L. 10. col. 611).

[7] 2 *Thess.* 2, 1-2; *Apoc.* 17-19.

consume all these kingdoms and itself shall stand forever" (Dan. 2, 44). This Fourth Monarchy of Daniel was interpreted by Jerome to signify the Roman Empire which was to last unto the coming of the Son of Man.[8] Jerome's theory was accepted by Augustine.[9] Nowhere in Augustine is there a trace to be found of the idea that the Roman Imperium will perish and a new Germanic society rise on its ruins. He knows of no other end for Rome than that which will bring on, at the same time, the downfall of the universe. Whether, however, the final day is imminent, he, unlike Jerome,[10] does not dare to decide.[11] The belief in the "Roma Aeterna" had taken such deep roots in Augustine, who had grown up in pagan beliefs in this matter, that he could not look with calm on the possibility of her final destruction. And even when the Vandals had laid siege to the city of Hippo, he did not relinquish hope. He died before the fall of the city, a true Roman, loyal to the Empire.

The ideas of Jerome—Augustine will be found with some modifications in the History of Orosius;[12] from Orosius they passed on through Isidore and Bede to the medieval writers, and there became the substructure upon which the philosophy of history of the Middle Ages was reared.

Now the question is, was this belief in the continuity of the Empire, founded to a great extent upon the ideas of Jerome and still more upon Augustine's theory of a double state, according to which both the Church and the Roman Empire represented something final, retained in the barbarian kingdoms which arose in Western Europe in the fifth century? The problem may be briefly stated thus: Did the Romans as well as the Germanic tribes, even after the deposition of the last Emperor in the West

---

[8] HIERON, *Comment in Danielem* liber, 2, 38 sqq.; 7, 7 sq. (Migne, P. L. 25, col. 503). Although Jerome is not the first to give this interpretation—it is found in Hippolytus and Eusebius—he has the merit of having given a simpler interpretation of this dream-vision and of having made it a part of a systematic conception of history.

[9] *De Civit. Dei*, 16, 17; 20, 23 (ed. Dombart, vol. 2, pp. 133 and 406).

[10] For the pessimistic outlook of Jerome see ep. 123, 127, 128 (ed. Hilberg, CSEL., vol. 56, pp. 91, 154, 161). Cf. REUMONT, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom.* 1, p. 733 sq.; 740 sqq.

[11] *De Civit. Dei*, 4, 7 (1 c. p. 136); *ep. ad Hesychium*, 197-199 (Augustini Opera, ed. Maurina, 2, p. 738 sqq.).

[12] *Historiarum adversus paganas*, 2, 1 (ed. Zangmeister, CSEL., vol. 5).

by Odoacer (476), still hold fast to the idea of Rome as a living, ruling world-power?

In order to give a complete answer, it would be necessary to examine in detail the opinions of the writers of the time in Gothic Italy[13] as well as in Burgundian, Frankish and Visigothic Gaul and Spain. One would, furthermore, have to study the views of the barbarian chieftains themselves, as to their relation to the Empire. I shall be obliged, on account of the extent of the subject matter, to restrict myself in this paper to Frankish Gaul.

Before entering on this matter, however, it may be useful to emphasize that the general impression that *the* or *a* Roman Empire was destroyed in the year 476 is not absolutely correct. Fifty years ago this was already pointed out by Bryce,[14] it is insisted on at length by Fustel de Coulanges,[15] by Mommsen,[16] and others. The contemporaries[17] are not aware of such a destruction having taken place, nor even of any striking, revolutionary change in conditions. The deposition of Augustulus by Odoacer was in their eyes nothing more than the temporary extinction of the imperial dignity in the West. That had happened before. The Imperium had always been conceived as one. Men were now indifferent, whether the seat of the Empire was in the East or in the West. For the time being, the men of the age found in the Emperors at Constantinople, (although they no longer exercised any real power over the West) the natural and legiti-

---

[13] For Italy the work has been already done—so far as I can see, thoroughly—by NICOLAS REITER, *Der Glaube an die Fortdauer des roemischen Reiches im Abendlande*, Muenster 1900. Judging from the title the author evidently intended to extend his investigations to the other countries of Western Europe. For some reason or other this was never done.

[14] BRYCE, *The Holy Roman Empire*, p. 26: "There was thus legally no extinction of the Western Empire at all, but only a reunion of East and West. In form, and to some extent also in the beliefs of men, things now reverted to their state during the first two centuries of the Empire, save that Byzantium instead of Rome was now the centre of the civil government."

[15] *L'Invasion Germanique et la fin de l'Empire*, p. 502 sqq.

[16] Ostgotische Studien, N. A. 14, p. 416: "Nicht die Gothen haben dem Westreich ein Ende bemacht, erst Kriser Justinian hat Italien nach der Ereberung in eine byzantinische Ravinz umgewandelt." ib., 542: "Man sollte diese Epoche nicht als die Bildung roemisch germanischer Koenigreiche bezeichnen, sondern als die Zersplitterung des roemischen Reiches in Teilstaaten."

[17] With one exception, MARCELLINUS COMES (*Chron.* a. 476; M. G. auct. ant. 11, p. 91).

mate representatives of imperial tradition. Legally the Odoacers, Theodorics, Gundobads, Sigismunds, Clovis, Althaulfs, and Eurics were merely the vicars of the Emperor at Constantinople. Although, therefore, the old Roman Empire still existed, what had disappeared, as Fustel de Coulanges well says,[18] was its power, and there remained nothing but an extremely venerable and inviolable dignity. The barbarians were filled with awe and reverence at the thought and sight of this venerable institution, but they obeyed it no longer; they possessed the strength and authority to command, and for a long time back men within the Empire had accustomed themselves to obey this commanding, barbarian power.

THE FRANKISH MONARCHY AND ROME.[19]

For an understanding of the relation of the Frankish kings to the Empire and for an appreciation of the national spirit of the Gallo-Romans not only the historians, but also those eminent men of the fifth and sixth century must be taken into consideration, who, because of the abnormal conditions of the times, played an important rôle as leaders of the Gallic magnates. "In the days of impotence, before the invasion," says Hauck, "the bishop had practically become the lord of the city. It was not ambition, that raised the bishops to this height, but they appeared to be what they were not, because they fulfilled duties which the representatives of the state were unable or refused to fulfill. The high position of the bishops had its deepest roots in the affections of the population. It was an inheritance from Roman times. But there were other circumstances which accounted for this position: above all, the fact that the bishops were mostly recruited from the ancient, respected, and wealthy families of the cities."[20]

We shall try, therefore, to become acquainted with the viewpoint of one or the other of these representatives of ecclesiastical policy in Gaul, then proceed to weigh the testimony of the few historians which have come down to us, and finally examine the

[18] L. c., p. 520.
[19] FUSTEL DE COULANGES, *L'Invasion Germanique*, p. 460 sqq.; DAHN, *Die Koenige der Germanen*, 7: *Das merovingische Frankenreich*.
[20] HAUCK, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, vol. 1, p. 125 sqq.

relation in which the Frankish kings stood to the Imperium Romanum.

At the head of the Gallic episcopate, in the age of Clovis, stood St. Remigius, the oracle of his time, who occupied the see of Reims for more than seventy years. Notwithstanding his intimate and frequent association with Clovis, only one letter to this monarch, which has any connection with our subject, has reached us. It is a letter of homage, written to Clovis at the beginning of his reign. Because of its bearing, however, on the political relation of Clovis to the Empire, it shall rather find its place when we treat of the Frankish kings and their relations to Constantinople.

Another document, highly valuable for an appreciation of the position of the Gallic bishops with regard to the barbarian kings, is a letter of congratulation by Avitus, bishop of Vienne, to the newly baptized Clovis. This important piece, of which I will cite a few of the more striking passages, has become the object of widely different interpretations. "Divine Providence," Avitus addresses Clovis, " has found the arbiter of our century; by accepting the true faith you have decided about all things, Your conversion is our victory. Your ancestors have made possible for you a great victory. You wished to prepare a still greater one for your successors. On this earth you rule as did your forbears, but in the kingdom of God you are the example of your descendants. *The Orient may congratulate itself on having chosen a prince*, who is ours now by faith; from now on it will not be the sole possessor of so great a grace.—Permit me to express another wish: since God intends, by your instrumentality, to make your people His own, do not fail to share the treasures of your faith with the nations that still live in paganism and have not been touched by pernicious doctrine (Arianism); send ambassadors to them and plead with them for the Lord, who has done so much for your cause."[21]

It cannot be maintained that this letter is a denial of his Roman sentiments on the part of Avitus, and that it implies the giving up of the Imperium. The sentiments expressed in his

[21] *Avitus episcop. Clodowecho regi*, 38 (41), a. 496/497 (M. G. hist., auct. ant., 6, p. post., 75 sq.). Compare the translation (with commentary) by KURTH, *Clovis*, vol. 1., p. 335 sqq.

correspondence with Constantinople at a much later period,[22] speak against such an assumption; in fact, the Roman Emperor is mentioned in our letter as the source of the authority of Clovis, as the one who had given Gaul its ruler. Avitus, therefore, undoubtedly wished to conserve the dependence of the Franks upon the Empire. I see in this letter above all an outburst of joy because of the conversion of the Franks, the first Germanic tribe to accept the orthodox faith. I find, furthermore, in these words an expression of delight at the glorious perspective of the conversion of all the German peoples by the Catholic Franks, who might, so Avitus felt, exert not only a Romanizing, but also a religious influence on the other tribes, without any disadvantage herefrom to the imperial authority. The whole tone of the letter would seem to show that Avitus, although a subject of Gundobad the Burgundian, looks at Clovis not in the light of an alien ruler, but rather in that of a "magister militum," a commander-in-chief, clothed with the authority of the Empire. The political significance of this letter, however, must not be overestimated. Godfrey Kurth characterizes Avitus as the Prophet of the Middle Ages, who, with the eyes of the seer and with wonderful clearness, foresaw in Clovis the heir of Roman power. In this letter, according to him, we find the idea of a vast Frankish Empire of the West, about to take the place of that of Rome.[23] This view presses the words of Avitus far too much. We must make due allowance for the rhetoric of Avitus, in order to grasp the real import of his thoughts. Moreover, Avitus himself emphasizes the idea that Clovis shall walk in the paths of his ancestors, which would hardly point to an extraordinary career in this world.

About the middle of the sixth century we meet with two men whose writings have an application to the subject which we are treating: Venantius Fortunatus and Gregory of Tours. Although we can learn but little from Venantius Fortunatus about the political relation of the Frankish kingdom to the Empire, he must be mentioned here, because he is a true representative of

---

[22] *Aviti epistola*, 83, a. 516/517 (M. G. l. c., p. 100). The Emperor remains for him the "gloriossimus princeps noster"; in Rome he sees the old splendor, the "prosperitas Romana"; it is the "apex mundi" (Ep. 9 (7); 38 (43), 48 (line 24); 34 (31), M. G. l. c. p. 43 sqq.).

[23] KURTH, *Clovis*, l. c.

Roman opinion and of the perishing Roman civilization of the sixth century.[24] He misses no opportunity of recalling, with reverence and affection, to the minds of his readers the Roman Caesar at Constantinople. There is a ring of genuine patriotism in the verses, addressed by him to the Emperor Justin and to Sophia, the imperial consort, in which he lauds the Emperor as the head of the "orbis terrarum," who rules with right over all the kings.[25] "All the nations of the East and the West, as far as the human race extends," he says in another passage of the same poem, "pay homage to the Emperor and praise him for his merits to the world."[26] As in the case of Avitus, it is necessary to divest these effusions of Fortunatus of some of their rhetoric, in order to reach the thought in the mind of the author. That Venantius Fortunatus believed in a de facto rule of the Emperor over the whole world is hardly credible, but the warmth and the copiousness of language in these productions show, how strongly the idea of the moral authority of the Imperium still prevailed among the Romans of Gaul.

In the ten books of the Historia Francorum by Gregory of Tours (died 593) one will but rarely find an expression of opinion by Gregory on the relation between the Empire and the Merovingian monarchy, since this work, with the exception of the first book and the first nine chapters of the second book, which have a more universal character, is a particular history, a collection of memoirs rather, in which the confusion and battles of the Merovingian epoch are depicted with remarkable objectivity and simplicity, although the narratives are not infrequently encumbered with the exuberant growth of legend. Pride in his Roman descent and religious zeal: these are the characteristics of Gregory of Tours, as we also find them in men of the stamp of Sidonius Apollinaris and Avitus. The Imperium still exists for him; Justin and Sophia rule it.[27]

---

[24] KOEBNER, *Venantius Fortunatus, seine Persoenlichkeit und seine Stellung in der geistigen Kultur des Merovingerreiches*, 1915.

[25] *Carminum* Appendix 2, v. 11 sqq.:

Gloria summa tibi, rerum sator atque redemptor,
Qui das Justinum iustus in orbe caput.
Rite super reges dominantem vindicat arcem
Caelesti regi qui famulando placet.
Quam merito Romae Romanoque imperat orbi.....

[26] Ib. v. 27 sq. and v. 45 sq. (M. G., Auct. Ant., 4, pars prior, p. 275-276).

[27] *Historia Francorum*, lib. 5, 19 (M. G. hist., Scr. rer. Merov., tom. 1).

His Roman standpoint may also be recognized in the fact that, like all Roman chroniclers of the fifth and sixth centuries, he follows Eusebius-Jerome. He begins his history, as they do, with the creation of the world. It is true, the classification of events according to the six world-periods and the four world-monarchies is not found in his work. The reason for this, however, is that his history being a particular history, it was not an easy matter to operate with world-periods and world-monarchies. He simply remarks, without any limitation whatsoever, that he follows the precedent set by these authorities.[28] That Gregory believed himself to live in the last Roman world-period, a faith shared by his contemporaries, would seem to be implied in his introductory words, that he has followed the traditional chronology on account of those who fear that the end of all things is imminent.[29] In his tenth book, the pestilence and famine, which had afflicted several cities of Gaul in the year 591, are brought into connection with the prophecies in Matthew and Luke, where there is question of the false Christs and the destruction of all things.[30]

It is certainly a remarkable fact, that in the more general part of his work, Gregory never mentions the capture of Rome by Alaric, nor the deposition of the last Emperor in the West: so much had even in Gregory's time the impression of these events been obliterated, events which we to-day regard as decisive catastrophies in the history of the Empire. These events were for Gregory and his contemporaries merely transient, though hard blows of fate, which could not by any means weaken the foundations of the last world-monarchy. Even though the throne in Rome was vacant, Constantinople, which since the death of the great Theodosius had been a seat of government of equal importance with Rome, still exercised, as the sole natural heir, dominion over the whole Imperium. In this faith Gregory lived. This is shown by the fact, that he counts events according to the years of Honorius and Arcadius; and he treats these two as if they were one single entity, as if they represented but

[28] *Ibid.*, Prologus, l. c., p. 35: "Ergo et nos scriptorum supra memoratorum exemplaria sequentes."
[29] *Ib.*, p. 33.
[30] Lib. 10, 25 (l. c., p. 437).

one government.[31] And, furthermore, it is with evident delight that he relates the conferring of the consulate upon Clovis by the Eastern Emperor. This event, of such importance for our study of the relation of Clovis to the Empire, will be spoken of later. Considering the objective character of Gregory's work, more can hardly be gleaned from the pages of his history, as to his personal opinions about the Empire. This much may be said with certainty: although he has great sympathy for the Franks, Gregory is by descent, education, and the tenor of his ideas, a Roman. The Empire still exists for him; that the Franks were to have a splendid future, is nowhere to be found in his history; on the contrary, Rome is the last world-monarchy which will perish only when the world perishes with it. His sympathy for the Franks will not be difficult to understand, if we remember that he is above all a bishop, and that in this capacity he is actuated by the most fervent zeal.

Finally, although the time of its composition goes beyond the limits of our theme, a chronicle may be mentioned here which is ascribed to Fredegar, and was written in the first half of the seventh century. Fredegar was a Gallo-Roman from Burgundy, and one of three compilers of the Historia Francorum. Full of false science, written in barbarous Latin, this chronicle bears the imprint of the rude age in which it was written; but it is an inestimable source for the last years of the sixth century and the first half of the seventh, because it is our only continuous narrative of events between the years 584-641.[32]

Still more pronounced than in Gregory of Tours is the Roman standpoint of the authors. Very significant for the views of Fredegar is the passage in which we are told how Childric, the father of Clovis, deposed by the Franks for immorality, seeks help at Constantinople.[33] So vivid was his idea of the natural and legitimate continuation of the Empire in the East, with its capital at Constantinople, that this author of the seventh century wholly overlooks the fact, that at the time of Childeric 458-

---

[31] *Ib.*, p. 55.

[32] *Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii scholastici*, ll. 4: M. G. hist. *Script. rer. Mercy.*, tom. 2. On the authorship of the parts of this chronicle, compare the keen investigations of KRUSCH, *Neues Archiv.*, 7, pp. 247-516.

[33] *Fredeg.* 3, 11, (l. c., p. 96); cf. GREGORY OF TOURS, *Hist.* Fr., 2, 12. See FUSTEL DE COULANGES, *L'Invasion Germanique*, p. 477, n. 2.

481 the Empire of the West still existed, that Severus was Emperor and resided in Ravenna. It was to Ravenna that Childeric really turned and not to Constantinople.

In giving to Syagrius the specifically Roman title "Patricius" —Gregory calls him "Romanorum rex"—Fredegar evidently implies that he recognizes a still higher authority, that of Caesar.[34]

From what we have seen so far, it may be inferred, that there existed among the great ecclesiastics and the writers of the Merovingian Age a belief in the continuity of Roman authority over the West, although practically this authority—call it sovereignty, or suzerainty, if you prefer—could but rarely be exercised. The farther we advance down the centuries, the looser this union between the Teutonic kingdoms and Byzantium becomes, and the more the Roman character of history-writing disappears.

We shall now proceed to examine the relation in which the Frankish kings stood to the Empire, and the views which they themselves had as to the continuity of imperial authority.

The most noteworthy document which has reached us from the beginnings of the reign of Clovis is the letter of St. Remigius to that monarch, mentioned above.[35] There we read: "The important news has come to us, that you have taken over the administration of Belgica Secunda (administratio).[36] We are not surprised that you are beginning to be that what your forefathers have always been. You must above all take heed that the guiding spirit of God leave you not, and that you retain the merits which your humility has gained for you. For, as the proverb says, 'the actions of men are judged by their outcome.' You should always surround yourself with counsellors, who will do honor to your name. When you do good, be without blemish and unselfish. *Honor your bishops* and allow them to advise you always. If you are in harmony with them, it will be to the welfare of your province (provincia). Encourage your fellow-citizens, console the sorrowing, protect the widows, feed the orphans, that all may fear and love you. Justice should speak out

[34] L. c., p. 90; p. 98.

[35] *M. G., Epist* 3, p. 113; cf. KURTH, *Clovis*, Introd., p. 13 sq.; FUSTEL DE COULANGES, l. c., p. 481 sqq.

[36] The reading Secundae Belgicae has been suggested by GUNDLACH and BETHMAN instead of secundum rei bellicae. (N. A., 13, p. 380).

of your mouth. Demand nothing from the poor and the stranger; accept no present from them. Let your tribunal (praetorium) be accessible to all, and no one should leave it with a sorrowful heart. Use the riches which you have inherited from your father to purchase the freedom of prisoners, so as to liberate them from the yoke of servitude. No one shall feel himself a stranger in your presence. Be jovial with the young, but take counsel with the old; if you wish to reign, show yourself worthy of it."

This is the wording of the letter to which such political importance has been ascribed. As far as the date is concerned, the whole contents, and especially the words "*rumor ad nos pervenit* administrationem vos Secundae Belgicae suscepisse," point to the beginning of the reign of Clovis, that is to say, to the assumption by him of civil and military control in Belgium, in the place of his father, who had enjoyed the dignity of a "magister militum" in northern Gaul. It is on account of its early date, that this letter has its importance for us. In the beginning of his reign, Clovis, as chieftain of a tribe of Franks, occupied but a limited territory in northern Gaul, wholly outside the episcopal jurisdiction of Remigius. What justified Remigius in giving such intimate, one might say authoritative, admonitions to a pagan prince, if this prince was not to stand in some sort of relation to him by virtue of his office? We shall probably not go astray, therefore, if we assume that Clovis was clothed with some kind of Roman office, that of comes, or of dux, or even magister militum over the whole of northern Gaul. We are not told this expressly, but it would seem to be implied in the words of the letter, especially, if we accept the correction "Administratio Secundae Belgicae." The whole cast of the letter, however, is Roman. There is nowhere an allusion to a barbarian, national monarchy, the name "Frank" does not appear, a proof that Remigius did not intend to address Clovis in his capacity as king of the Franks. The expressions used are all of such a character that they might most fittingly be applied to an imperial official (administratio, provincia, praetorium).[37] It would seem very probable, therefore, that Clovis, besides his kingship over the Franks, had inherited from his father—there

[37] FUSTEL DE COULANGES, l. c., p. 485.

is no evidence that it had ever been formally conferred upon him by the Emperor—the office of magister militum.[38] On this supposition, the words *"non est novum,* (we are not surprised), ut coeperis esse ut parentes tui semper fuerunt" take on a new meaning and become more intelligible. If we see in Clovis the representative of the Emperor in northern Gaul, then it is conceivable, how a Gallo-Roman bishop, living outside the territory immediately occupied by the Franks, could venture to approach him in the rôle of a mentor and confidential adviser. But, whatever Clovis's own conception of his position in Gaul may have been, in the mind of Remigius and of the Gallo-Romans of the higher classes, his relation to the Empire was not different from that of Odoacer, of Theodoric the Goth, or of the Visigothic and Burgundian kings.

To all this someone might ask, does not the fact that Clovis invaded the territories of Syagrius, the son of the former magister militum Egidius,[39] who himself claimed to be the Emperor's representative in Gaul, go to show that Clovis intended to give the death blow to imperial power, or at least to establish the claim to be the only legitimate representative of the Emperor's authority in Gaul? In answer I would say that it is practically impossible, with the information at our disposal, to define the status of Syagrius with regard to the Empire. The historians of the age had no clear idea of his position in Gaul. Neither Gregory, nor Fredegar, nor the "Vita Remigii" are in harmony as to the title which he bore.[40] About his titles and the character of his rule we know as little as about the extent of it.

We will be nearest the truth, if we characterize his government as very similar to a royal one. The troops, cities and ter-

---

[38] The interpretation here suggested, previously proposed by DUBOS, PETIGNY and GASQUET is rejected by FUSTEL DE COULANGES (l. c., p. 486 sq.). His theory, however, that Clovis and the other Frankish chieftains, although without any official titles, were really Roman functionaries, exercising their powers in the name of the Empire, and considered as such by Remigius and the mass of the Roman population, is not in disagreement with our general line of argument.

[39] GREG. TUR., *Hist. Fr.*, 2, 11-12.

[40] GREGORY calls him "rex Romanorum," a title which never existed in the Roman Empire (*Hist. Fr.*, 2, 27); FREDEGAR (3, 15) says: "Siagrius Romanorum patricius; the Vita Remigii has: "successit in principatum Romanorum.....Siagrius" and in another passage, "Siagrius, dux Romanorum" (*M. G., Scr. rer. Merov.*, 3, cap. 14, pp. 291, 25, 29). Cf. FUSTEL DE COULANGES, *ib.*, p. 489.

ritories in Gaul which had as yet not been touched by the invasion, and which had been formerly subject to his father Egidius, now rallied about the son, seeking protection against a probable attack on the part of Visigoths, Burgundians or Franks. In short, when Clovis proceeded against Syagrius, he did not attack the Empire; on the contrary, it would seem, from the reports which we possess, to have been more of a personal quarrel. Syagrius was an object of suspicion to Clovis, because of his relations to the hated Burgundians.[41] This would explain the attack on Syagrius and the conquest of his territory (486).

It is significant that, after the defeat of Syagrius, the march of Clovis southward to the Loire nowhere took on the character of a war, of a violent conquest, of a rebellion against Emperor and Empire. It is clear from the narrative of Gregory of Tours that the vast majority of the cities submitted voluntarily, and that the Roman troops, scattered about the country, joined the army of the Frankish king.[42] The reason for this would seem to be that the Roman Gauls saw in Clovis the representative of the Emperor and not the ferocious leader of a conquering people; it was no unusual sight for them to see Germanic generals, clothed with Roman offices and titles, marching through their land. They were pleased, since the Emperor of the East was not in a position to defend them against the aggressions of Euric, to submit to a ruler, who posed as a representative of the Emperor, in order that by such a step they might at least save their municipal liberties. It is needless to insist on the well-known fact that the conversion of Clovis to Catholicism[43] had an enormous influence on his success and on the strengthening of the sympathies of the Gallo-Romans for his cause. When Clovis returned to Tours after the war with the Visigoths (508),

---

[41] ..... il n'y a pas dans toute l'historie de Clovis un seul fait qui le presente comme un ennemi de l' Empire. Il y en a un au contraire," on il reconnaie formellement l'Empire, au moins comme autorité suprême (the investiture with the consulate). FUSTEL DE COULANGES; l. c., p. 499. For the friendship of Syagrius with the Burgundians see the letter of SIDONIUS APPOLLINARIS in *M. G., Auct. ant.*, 8, Epist. 5, (5).

[42] GREG. TUR., *Hist. Fr.*, 2, 23 and 2, 35. There was opposition, however, in several cities: in Rouen (ib. 2, 36), in Nantes (GREG. TUR., *De aloria Martyrum* c. 59, l. c., p. 528), and in Paris. On the attitude of the Roman troops, see Procopius, De bello Gothico, l. 12 (Loeb, Classics).—On the inhabitants of Auvergne see Gibbon, Decline and Fall, 4, p. 134 (Bury's edition).

[43] See the beautiful introduction of KURTH to his *Clovis*.

he was met there by an embassy of the Emperor Anastasius, which brought him the title of "consul."[44] This conferring of the consulate on Clovis is of great importance for an understanding of the idea of the times as to the relation between the Empire and the Franks. It must have made an especially deep impression on the Gallo-Romans, among many of whom the dogma of the "Imperium aeternum" had deep roots.[45] From the standpoint of the Emperor this distinction was given not only in order to conserve to the Empire the friendship and alliance of the Franks in an eventual war with the Ostrogoths, but above all to reaffirm and revive the ancient and legal suzerainty of the Empire over Gaul which had become somewhat effaced and obscured during the migrations. Whatever the private opinion of Clovis about the whole affair may have been, this investiture with the consulate was for him, as far as his Roman subjects were concerned, of great importance. He now stood before their eyes, if not the successor, at least the representative of Caesar in Gaul.[46] "From[47] this day on," says Gregory of Tours, "he was, as it were, consul and Augustus." That Clovis considered this title of importance, is shown by the solemnity, with which he surrounded the conferring of this honor upon himself. The diadem on his forehead, clad in purple, scattering coins among the populace he proceeded to the Cathedral of Tours with great pomp.[48] Thus Clovis gave his rule a special sanctity in the eyes of the Romans of Gaul. This title legalized his authority over

---

[44] GREG. TUR., *Hist.* Fr., 2, 38: 'Igitur ab Anastasio imperatore codecillos de consulato accepit et in basilica beati Martini tunica blattea indutus et chlamide, imponens, vertice diadema .....et ab ea die tamquam consul aut Augustus est vocitatus." According to Bury the expression "tamquam consul" would be equivalent here to "ex consule" the official title of honorary consuls. (BURY, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 1923, vol. 1, p. 464; FUSTEL COULANGES, l. c., p. 500 sqq.). In the Lex Salica Clovis is called "proconsul" (ed. Behrend, p. 125). On this difficulty see BURY, l. c., and his notes on Gibbon, vol. 4, p. 118 sq.; also KURTH *Clovis*, 2, p. 93.

[45] Cf. KURTH, l. c., p. 94. Gibbon very pertinently remarks: "It was a name, a shadow, an empty pageant..... But the Romans were disposed to revere, in the person of their master, that antique title, which the Emperors condescended to assume; the Barbarian himself seemed to contract a sacred obligation to respect the majesty of the republic (l. c., p. 119); FUSTEL DE COULANGES, l. c., p. 507 sq.

[46] "Par le titre qu il recevait, il reconnaissait l'empereur, et il était reconnu de lu." FUSTEL DE COULANGES, ib., p. 507.

[47] l. c.

[48] *l. c.*

a province which, nominally at least, remained a part of the Empire.[49]

The immediate successors of Clovis continued in his footsteps and maintained friendly relations with Byzantium. Unfortunately the sources for the first half of the sixth century are too meager to permit us to sketch the relations between the Franks and Constantinople consecutively and accurately. Two letters of king Theudebert (533-548) have been preserved which testify to great deference toward Justinian on his part. The Emperor is there called "illuster et praecellentissimus *dominus*" and "Augusta Celsitudo,"[50] and what is more remarkable, Theudebert, in obedience to a demand by Justinian, makes a report on the condition and extent of his dominions in Gaul.[51] The same king deems it necessary to legalize his occupation of the Provence by asking Justinian for his approval.[52] A peculiar fact is related by Fredegar, namely, that in the year 628 the Emperor Heraclius ordered King Dagobert to cause all the Jews of his kingdom to become Catholics. The chronicler adds: "Aeraclius per omnes provincias emperiae talem idemque facere decrevit,"[53] giving us to understand, it would seem, that at that time Gaul was still numbered among the imperial provinces.

The coins of the age also give evidence that the idea of the continuity of the Empire was still vivid. The coins found in the tomb of Childeric naturally bear the image of Caesar. But also the coins which have come down to us from the successors of Clovis, are engraved with the likeness and the names of the Emperors Anastasius, Justin, I, Justinian, and Justin II.[54] We have here a proof that the Frankish kings believed themselves to rule in the name of the Roman Imperator and that Constanti-

---

[49] FUSTEL DE COULANGES, ib., p. 507; SCHULTZE, *Das Merovingische Frankenreich*, (1896), p. 75.

[50] *M. G., Epist.* 3, ep. 19 and 20 (p. 132). The word "dominus" was the title used by subjects, when speaking to their master and lord.

[51] Ib., ep. 20: "Dignamini esse solliciti in quibus provinciis habitemus secundum voluntatem vestram, quae Deus nobis concesserit, simplici relatione mandamus."

[52] PROCOPIUS *de bello Gothico*, 3, 33.

[53] L. c., 4, 65.

[54] I have not been able to consult, at first hand, the special literature on the Merovingian coins. I refer the reader, therefore, to the article "France" by LECLERCQ in the *Dictionnaire d'Archeologie et de Liturgic chretienne*, vol. 5, p. 2562 sq.; FUSTEL DE COULANGES, l. c., p. 509 sq.

nople was still, in a way, the capital of the world. When Theudebert, on account of some political differences with Justinian, for a time endeavored to break loose completely from the imperial authority, he gave expression to his rebellious spirit by coining money with the inscription "Victor" and with his own name in place of that of the Emperor.[55] Referring to this fact, undoubtedly, Procopius of Caesarea makes the significant comment: "They coin money, from Gallic gold not, as is customary, with the images of the Caesars, but with their own."[56] Procopius evidently sees in this procedure on the part of Theudebert something of a revolutionary nature. Theudebert's disaffection did not descend to his successor Theudebald (548-555). This ruler restored amicable relations with Constantinople and returned to the former system of coinage.[57]

The Vita S. Trevirii makes an interesting remark to the year 524: "It was at the time that Gaul was under the government of the Emperor Justin," and to the year 539 this same Vita comments, referring, it would seem, to the treason of Theudebert, "when the Gallic and Frankish kings abolished the rights of the Emperor, despised the sovereignty of the Empire and ruled by virtue of their own authority."[58] In the year 524 Gaul was therefore still considered to be subject to Constantinople.

Even though the Empire never yielded its suzerainty over the West, and though the Frankish kings accorded the Emperor a kind of vague overlordship over their kingdom, still these kings were de facto independent rulers, and their relations with Con-

---

[55] There is no trace of the name of a barbarian king in Gaul on any coin before Theudebert. The inscription on his coins reads: "Dominus Theodebertus Victor." Otherwise the imperial type of the coins, the image of the emperor, etc., is retained. For a facsimile of these coins see LECLERCQ, l. c.

[56] PROCOPIUS l. c., 3, 33. The minting of gold coins, with his own image was a privilege of the Emperor exclusively, which was never transferred to anyone. The violation of it was considered a sacrilege and punishable with death (*Codex Theod.*, lib. 9, *tit.* 23: "Sacrilega sententia subeat et cauita plectatur)."

Even the Persian kings, though privileged to issue silver coins with their own image, formed no exception to this rule. The coins in gold which left their mints, all bore the image of the "basileus" of the Romans.

[57] FUST. DE COUL., l. c. From 555 onward the images of the emperors Mauritius, Tiberius, Phocas and Heraclius are still found on the coins, though no longer exclusively. Since 613 they disappear completely. LECLERCQ, l. c.

[58] *Vita s. Treviri* cited by FUSTEL COULANGES, l. c., p. 511.

stantinople were generally limited to respectful and polite phrases. But among the Gallo-Roman population the belief in the continuation of the Empire and in its authority over the whole Occident remained unimpaired. The hatred of the Roman despotism, which had weighed so heavily on the people of Gaul during the fourth and fifth centuries, had disappeared with the definite transference of the imperial capital to Constantinople, and the temporary dislike for the Empire had been superseded by the vivid remembrance of a venerable, supreme and inviolable power to which one delighted to turn in times of distress.

Especially the discontented and the usurpers loved to turn to Constantinople, as to the only power able to fulfill their demands and legitimize their usurpations, just as on the other hand, the Emperor favored those who approached him for the realization of their plans, because he found in such steps on their part the best guarantee that his proteges would preserve their relation of dependence on the Empire.

Further evidence for the attention which was paid to the East and the Emperor in Gaul at that time may be found in the chronological systems employed by the chroniclers of the fifth and sixth centuries. We meet there, side by side with the consular era, the counting of events according to the years of the Emperors, and even the Byzantine indictions. The facts are an eloquent testimony to the way of thinking of the age.[59]

What is the conclusion to be drawn from what we have seen? Clovis is perhaps, with the exception of Theodoric, the only Germanic chieftain who understood upon what foundation his work must be reared in order to last. He accepted the counsel of politically well-informed men, the Gallic bishops, whose faith he adopted and whose ecclesiastical organization with its subjection to the Papacy he accepted. Keenly understanding the sentiments and aspirations of his new subjects, he did not hesitate to accept a kind of overlordship of the Empire in the political domain. The France of Clovis and his successors was not in-

[59] I have already referred to the practice of GREGORY OF TOURS. FUSTEL DE COULANGES offers some interesting texts from the chronicle of St. Waast (ib., p. 513). For the Italian chroniclers see REITER, *Der. Glaube an die Fortdauer des roemischen Reiches im Abendlande*, p. 30 sq. et passim.

deed a mere continuation of the Imperium, but the policies of Clovis were imperial. The author of the "Lex Salica" speaks with enthusiasm of the title of "proconsul" which the king had received from the Emperor. The forms of administration, the finances, system of jurisprudence, the whole organization of the imperial age was bodily taken over by the Franks. In short, the monarchical power of Clovis appears to us as an outgrowth of Roman views, of Roman mentality. As a reward, and in order, as it were, to place his seal of approval on these tendencies in the two races towards a cultural unity inspired by Roman ideals, Anastasius solemnly invests Clovis with the Consulate. In a word, the barbarian invasion of Gaul was a mere external and formal fact. Gaul was not conquered by the barbarians, but they were won for the Empire.

HERMAN FISCHER, Ph. D.,
Josephinum,
Columbus, Ohio.

NECROLOGY

The passing of Cardinal Logue on November 19 bereaved Irish Catholics and the Universal Church of a remarkable man. With perhaps the exception of our beloved Cardinal Gibbons, there was no Cardinal so well known as Cardinal Logue. Tributes innumerable from the press have been rendered to the great priest, Bishop, and Primate who filled a span of nearly sixty years with fruitful and manifold labors. One who knew him has written for the London *Universe* an appreciation which we reproduce:

There was no Cardinal in the modern world like Cardinal Logue. He was so distinctive a personality, so essentially Irish in all his characteristics; and as no one who is not an Irishman could be compared with him at all, it is probably safe to say that there had never been any Cardinal like him before. For he was the first Cardinal who had occupied the Primacy of All Ireland.

There have been a hundred and eight Primates since the time of Saint Patrick, and until Michael Archbishop Logue, received his Cardinal's hat, twenty-five years ago, there never was a Cardinal among them.

The greatest tribute to the power of any man's personality is that he should be constantly talked about; and if that be the surest test there can be no denying that Cardinal Logue was a very remarkable man. There is literally no end to the stories one hears about him; and they all convey the same impression, that His Eminence was a simple, homely priest with an irresistible sense of humour, who recalled the days of the early saints who loved little children, and birds and animals and flowers, and led their simple holy lives among their people, who knew that they were saints and loved them for it.

He lived in the imagination of his people above all by his charming human ways. All over Ireland they have known instances of his little acts of gracious kindness to small children and to the old and poor.

When one thinks of Cardinal Logue one is reminded of endless stories of the early Irish saints who worked extraordinary miracles with an incredible lightness of touch, and who never forgot that they were Irishmen.

It is not for nothing that Cardinal Logue was born in the far highlands of County Donegal—on a beautiful and wild peninsula that runs into the Atlantic, in a village called Carrigart; for not far from there was born, many centuries before, one of the greatest, and the most intensely national, of all the Irish saints, Columcille; and the Donegal peasants will tell you to-day with their own devout faith that it is a striking instance of how history repeats itself.

Like the Irish prelates of the old days whom he resembled so closely, he was a born fighter, fearlessly independent and forcible in his own opin-

ions, and he enjoyed a battle which was worth fighting. In Ireland, where strong personalities are remarkably frequent, he stood out pre-eminent, and there is no country in which force of character is more fully appreciated.

For nearly fifty years he had been recognised as a daring and uncompromising leader. In recent years he had seldom taken any direct part in public affairs; but he was among the first public men in Ireland to denounce German invasion of Belgium as an outrage against Christendom, and he did much to assist the organisation of Belgian charities in Ireland.

As a public speaker Cardinal Logue was inimitable; simple, direct, and with a constant flow of spontaneous wit; he never raised his voice, but stood a venerable figure, with his hands folded before him, and talked in his very Irish accent, with a delightful neatness and precision and quiet good humour.

He was the beloved priest of Irish tradition. The characteristic gentleness and humour were all his, and the cleverness and the qualities of leadership no less.

MISCELLANY

THE INDUSTRIAL POSITION OF WOMAN IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

It has been definitely proved that there existed a "woman question" in the Middle Ages. During that period there was question chiefly of providing means of support for those women who were prevented from following their natural vocation. Under ordinary circumstances they either sought employment in some household, or admission into a guild, or a convent. The convents of beguines, in particular, helped much to solve the woman-question of that day, by organizing into communities large numbers of women who would, in many instances, be without means of support. Concerning the convents of the beguines much information is found in KEMP, *Die Wohlfahrtspflege des Kölner Rats im Jahrhundert nach der grossen Zunftrevolution*, Bonn, 1904, and in WOIKOWSKY-BIEDAU, *Das Armenwesen des mittelalterlichen* Köln, Breslau, 1891. BEHAGHEL, from whose scholarly treatise, *Die gewerbliche Stellung der Frau im mittelalterlichen Köln*, the following outline of the guilds of women in Cologne has been drawn, shows to what extent women found employment in the guilds of that city during the fourteenth and the fifteenth century. From this account may be seen also how far the guilds in general contributed to solve the industrial question of woman employment in the later Middle Ages.

Among the large number of guilds in medieval Cologne there were three composed almost exclusively of women—the admission of men being an exception. They were:—the guilds of the yarn-spinners, the gold-spinners and the silk-weavers, to which were joined the silk-spinners until their formation into a separate guild.

The yarn-spinner guild, which is typical in its organization of the arrangement and ruling found in the other guilds, appears to have been first officially organized in 1370. At least, as far as is known, there was issued in that year an official document, the Ordinance, which definitely legislated on many points regarding the organization and work of the guild. Another official document, the Amtsbrief, dated April 14, 1397—the year in which most of the other guilds (34 in number) received new guild-charters (Zunftbriefe)—either confirmed or modified the regulations of the Ordinance. The guild of the yarn-spinners was, therefore, legally established before 1400.

The rulings of the above mentioned documents show that the guild possessed a complete staff of officers. Two deputies, representing the city authorities, were to be chosen every half year. They had the duty to inspect the work furnished by the guild-members, to punish infractions against guild-regulations and to render judgment conjointly with the guild-directors against those producing work not answering the requirements of the guild. Detailed regulations, however, specifying the duties of the guild-officers proper are found only in a city ordinance of May 1, 1456.

Better information is available on this point for the guild of the gold-spinners. The regulations for this guild provide that every year shall be chosen from the number of gold-smiths,— whose guild was closely connected with that of the gold-spinners,—and from the number of gold-spinners two members charged with the supervision of the work of the guild: the guild-masters are to direct the work and affix the seal of the city upon the ware which has been examined by the guild-mistresses. Such and similar regulations found in every guild was a sure guarantee for the quality of ware handed over to the salesman and merchant.

The guild regulations of the yarn-spinners as well as the other guilds provide directly and indirectly for a thorough training of those wishing to learn the trade. In the guild of yarn-spinners candidates applying for admission into the guild had to pass an examination to prove their ability to furnish the required quality of ware, i. e. "Kaufmannsgut." Upon her admission the candidate paid two gulden entrance fee. Daughters of guild members were required to pay only half that sum.

Every girl or woman received as an apprentice by a guild member was required, by the Ordinance, to spend not less than six years in learning the trade. This term of apprenticeship the "Amtsbrief" of 1397 shortened to four years. While learning the trade the apprentice might change mistresses not more than once and even in that case it must be the mistress that is in fault; if the apprentice was obliged to leave through her own fault no mistress could receive her as an apprentice. The mistress receiving an apprentice was obliged to enroll her in an official register of the guild, under a fine of six shillings, within eight days. Guild regulations impose a fine of two gulden on the one who dismissed, as fully qualified, an apprentice in less than four years.

Besides the help of the one apprentice, a mistress of the yarn-spinners' guild might employ two maid servants to assist her in the work. She was, however, forbidden to hire the help of servants employed by another guild member. A transgression of this ruling was punished with a fine of two gulden and a dismissal of such servants at once. A servant proved guilty of dishonesty in the service of her mistress could not in future be employed by any guild member. Failure to observe this regulation was punished with a fine of one mark. Rulings of this kind, found to a greater or less extent in all guilds, aimed to keep the business of guild-members small and to prevent the monopolizing of the business by rich guild-members to the disadvantage of the less fortunate ones.

Other rulings of the guild regulated the hours of work, specified the days on which work was unlawful, and thus provided for the necessary rest from labor. The "Amtsbrief" of 1397 forbade all night-work. No work was to be begun before day-break, nor could it be continued after the ringing of the night-bell, probably about eight o'clock. If a mistress failed against this rule she had to pay a fine of one mark, if it was a servant that transgressed it she paid a fine of half that sum. According to the Ordinance work had to be concluded on Saturdays, the vigil of the feasts of the Apostles, the Blessed Virgin and other feast-days from East-

er to the first of October—at six o'clock, and from the first of October to Easter, at five o'clock. On feast-days and Sundays, all work was forbidden, except such that could not be postponed.

To these and similar regulations were joined others that insured the production of a good quality of yarn. The yarn offered for sale must have the required weight; for every "Lot" missing to the pound of a fixed number of skeins a fine of one shilling was exacted. Nor might the weight of the yarn be unlawfully increased; the Ordinance forbade the storage of the finished yarn in cellars to secure that purpose. It was also against the guild regulations to dye untwisted yarn, to mix various kinds of yarn, etc.

Although the rules of the guild limited, as has been shown, the number of assistants in the work, it was permissable to engage outside help for a limited time, to satisfy the demands of customers. The time allowed was fourteen days, and could be extended if necessary, but during the time that a guild member secured outside help she was forbidden to do any work herself. This regulation evidently discouraged the practice and aimed, with other regulations already mentioned, to keep the business of a guild-member small.

There are no regulations of the yarn-spinners guild extant which determine the salary to be paid to hired laborers. This is the more remarkable since there were detailed regulations on that point in other guilds, as for instance that of the silk-weavers.

The prohibition to sell ware made by others is not found in the guild of yarn-spinners but existed in several other guilds. In regard to the sale of yarn the guild-regulations forbade to furnish ware to the salesmen not belonging to the guilds. The men regularly charged with that part of the business in the yarn-makers' guild, as well as the other guilds organized by women, were the husbands of women belonging to the guild. A transgression of this rule was punished with a fine of one gulden.

Closely associated with the yarn-spinners' guild was the guild of men occupied with the twisting of the yarn. It appears that the differences arising between these guilds were numerous and that the yarn-spinners often brought their complaints against the yarn-twisters before the city authorities. A document dated from October 1373 contains a petition of the salesmen requesting that the high wages demanded by the yarn-twisters be reduced by city legislation. That the quarrel continued may be deduced from the fact that the city authorities were still concerned with the same question a hundred years later.

The position of the yarn-spinners, considering all in all, seems not to have been a bad one. Their condition, regulated by the Ordinance, from 1370-1397, was much improved by the "Amtsbrief" of 1397. All further guild-regulations were concerned with the interests of the guild and contributed much to its prosperity during the fifteenth century.

With the guild of the gold-spinners was closely connected that of the gold-smiths. They were frequently the husbands of women belonging to

the gold-spinners' guild and shared in the administration of its government, as has already been indicated.

A charter (Zunftbrief), received by this guild in 1397, probably regulated the affairs of the association as it did in the yarn-spinners' guild. That the guild existed at an earlier date might be deduced from a document of 1373, in which are mentioned the "auri malliatores" as well as the "filatrices." There is, however, no evidence available supporting that supposition.

The guild of gold-spinners did not, in general, differ in its organization from that of the yarn-spinners. It had similar regulations prescribing the quality of ware to be furnished by the guild members, similar requirements governing the admission of members into the guild and the reception of girls and women as apprentices. A ruling peculiar to this guild and that of the silk-weavers is found in the severe measures taken against stealing, which is easily understood when the costliness of the material employed in the fabrication of the ware is considered. The penalty imposed on persons guilty of theft and dishonesty was a heavy money fine, or expulsion from the guild. If the offense was very grievous they were exiled from the city. Another remarkable feature in the regulations of the guild is the absence of rulings governing the hours of work, the employment of outsiders, and the relations of the gold-spinners to the goldsmiths.

The silk-weavers, the third of the exclusively feminine guilds, employed the silk-spinners and the silk-dyers. The silk-spinners formed a separate guild in 1456, but the silk-dyers appear never to have formed an independent guild organization. The earliest guild-charters and regulatons of the silk-weavers' guild, which have survived, date from 1469, 1467, 1480. They do not, in general, differ from those issued to the guilds already discussed.

That this guild was large and influential is evident from the remarkably large number of names recorded many of them being names of ladies of high social rank. H. KOCH, in his *Geschichte des Seidengewebes in Köln,* Staats-und socialwissen-schaftliche Forschungen, Band 128 (1907), gives an extensive list of names and a very complete survey of the silk-weavers' trade in Cologne. Selections of this work are edited by B. KUSKE in *Historische Vierteljahrsschrift, XI,* VTJR.

Among the regulations peculiar to this guild must be mentioned that of 1506, which ordains that no girl should be received as apprentice before completing her eleventh year; another, which requires an oath of the apprentice, on entering the profession, to fulfill faithfully all guild regulations; and a third, issued in 1549, which provides for regular meetings of the guild-members and officers with the "gentlemen of the silk-office" to adjust grievances and correct abuses.

Besides the guild composed exclusively of women, there was a large number of guilds of men which admitted women, either with equality of rights or under certain restrictions. The women who found employment in guilds of men were, in the first place, the wives and daughters of men

belonging to the guild, but in several instances it was also permitted to employ servant girls. The guilds which admitted women with rights equal to those of men, were the guilds of the bedspread weavers, the escutcheon embroiderers and the wool-weavers.

Among the guilds which more or less restricted the rights of women was the guild of dyers, and the guild of the cotton-weavers; in the leather industry that of the purse-makers, girdle-makers and tanners; in the metal industry that of the needle manufacturers, as well as the guilds of the gold-smiths, copper-smiths and blacksmiths. In the wood-work trades women enjoyed full rights in the guilds of the coopers and turners. The tailors' guild likewise admitted them as fully qualified. The admission of women was prohibited in the guilds of harness-makers and hat manufacturers. They were admitted into the shoe-makers' guild under certain restrictions. In the barbers' guild they possesed equal rights with men. In the guilds occupied with the preparation of food-stuffs women were fully qualified in the bakers' guild, and they were also employed in the brewers' guild, but it is not certain whether as fully qualified members or under restrictions. Women seem also to have been extensively engaged in the fish-trade, both within and without the guild. Various lists of names record likewise the names of women in the butcher and cattle-trade guilds.

In practically all these guilds a widow was authorized to continue the business of her husband, with the aid of men; in case she married again she usually lost that right if the man she married was not a guild member. The names of women recorded in lists registering the names of guild members are, however, comparatively few. In a list of 77 names in the gold-smiths' guild, for instance, only three are women; a list enumerating the names of 56 men of the barbers' guild records the names of two women; another of the same guild mentions the names of 71 men and 19 married women as well as two widows. A register of the blacksmiths' guild enumerates, in 1418, the names of three women together with those of 75 men but only one is expressly mentioned as a "smith." It is probable that in other guilds, whose occupations were more suitable to women, a larger number found employment.

SISTER M. PIA, Ph.D.

THE OLD CATHOLIC CHAPEL AND GRAVEYARD NEAR AQUIA, STAFFORD COUNTY, VA.

When some months ago, the Right Rev. D. J. O'Connell, Bishop of Richmond, purchased six acres of land at the cross-roads near Wayside, in Stafford County, Va., he took the initial step to restore to its sacred uses the oldest land in the Old Dominion which had come under Catholic ownership. Wayside has been carved out of the old plantation of Richland on the broad highway connecting Washington and Richmond and is exactly fourteen miles from Fredericksburg. It is an orchard farm now but it occupies the site of the villege of Aquia or Acquia which has an honorable record in history, once the scene of busy operations in the nearby quarries and possessing a substantial warfage from which ships sailed to foreign ports carrying grain and tobacco and to domestic harbours with the beautiful white marble which abounds in this section. Acquia in Richland furnished the stone from which the earliest buildings in Philadelphia and thereabout were composed and from it came the material of which the United States Capitol and other Federal structures were erected. The old wharf at Richland received the last ship which cleared a British port for this country prior to the revolution and on it was one passenger of stupendous importance in Catholic annals, Father John Carroll. But Acquia has passed away. Grass had overgrown its tidy streets before the past century was old, its manor house, first abandoned and then destroyed is difficult if not impossible to trace in the woodland tangle and the small stone structure where Catholics worshiped for the first time in Virginia and the Holy Rood where the confessors of the faith await the glorious resurrection had years ago become a forgotten spot.

Acquia and the adjacent island of Widdington is part of the manor grant of 30,000 acres between the Potomac and the Rappahannock Rivers which James II bestowed on Captain George Brent of Woodstock, England, in 1687. Captain Brent was the half nephew of Giles and Foulke Brent whose names bristle on the pages of Leonard Calvert's administration as governor of Maryland and it was to his home that these gentlemen and their sisters, Margaret and Mary, came for refuge from troubles in Lord Baltimore's palatinate. George Brent, the immigrant and founder of the Acquia branch of the Brent line, called his estate Woodstock after his old home, but in later years, though the laws of primogeniture were strictly enforced, that portion which bordered on the Potomac and on which the village of Acquia was built was called Richland. At the time that Fr. John Carroll returned from England disheartened and believing his ecclesiastical career ended in the prime, William Brent was the owner of Richland whilst his elder brother Robert resided at Woodstock.

These Brent brothers who were fourth in descent from George the immigrant had married sisters of the future prelate, Robert's wife being Anne the eldest of the four daughters of Daniel Carroll of Marlborough

and Eleanor Darnall of Woodyard and Mrs. William Brent, Eleanor was the second daughter. Robert and Anne Brent were the parents of that Robert Brent who was the first mayor of Washington and who held the office for the first ten years of the National Capital's existence.

James II in granting to Captain George Brent of Woodstock, this princely domain in Virginia, had added an inestimable privilege, that of liberty of conscience and free right to practice his religion on his estate and elsewhere, a rare privilege in those days. Associated with George Brent in obtaining land and the promise of religious liberty were Richard Foote, gentleman of Kent and Nicholas Hayward and Robert Basston, gentlemen of London. This Captain Brent was the son of a country squire who bore the same name, George, and his mother was the Lady Mariana, daughter of Sir John Dunnington of the Island of Ely. There were six brothers of the immigrant all of whom had borne arms for the Stuart cause. Early in 1687, George Brent had taken possesson of his patrimony and had begun the erection of the handsome stone mansion Woodstock which figures in colonial social chronicles during the next hundred years. George Brent was twice married, his first wife was Mary, daughter of Captain William Green of Bermuda and his second spouse bore the name of Mary also, and was the daughter of the Honorable Henry Seward of Mattapony, Secretary of the Maryland province, and his wife who became later the second consort of Charles Calvert, third Baron of Baltimore.

As the seventeenth century drew to its stormy close in the colonies of Great Britain travel between Virginia and Maryland was almost entirely by water. Captain Brent brought his bride by boat to the port of Acquia and made the journey inland by horse. For the convenience of Catholics who were nearer to Acquia than to chapels of Maryland and for whom the long journey to the manor house at Woodstock would have been a hardship, the stone building which had been erected in connection with the port was pressed into service and here the Holy Sacrifice was offered openly for a few happy years, and then furtively and at tragic risk later when the penal laws were in force.

In the archives of Annapolis where the personal papers of the Lords Palatinate of Maryland are kept, may be read a letter from Charles Calvert earnestly advising his son-in-law because of religious persecution to dispose of his holdings in Virginia and to make his home nearby his kindred in Maryland. But George Brent was made of sterner stuff. Though there are absolutely no records which can be quoted to prove the continuous existence of this humble place of worship the ruins of which Bishop O'Connell has rescued from oblivion, there is abundant collateral proof. Robert and William Brent were in 1760 classmates of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and of John and Daniel Carroll of Marlborough at the first Catholic academy in the English speaking portion of the United States, that of Bohemia Manor conducted by the Jesuits. Many family letters, several of which may be inspected in the James Dudley Morgan collection as yet unassorted or indexed in the Library of Congress, which

tell of visits of the priests of Bohemia Manor, and in other parts of Maryland to Richland near which was the building that in penal days must needs present any appearance save that of a church and in which, from time to time, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was offered. The Brents of the fourth generation were therefore professing that which had been the creed of the heads of the family from Captain George down to Robert the Mayor, who was the first definitely to abandon the Virginia patrimony and take residence in the new Federal city.

Bishop O'Connell hopes to rebuild the humble chapel along the lines shown by the stone foundations. He is diligently searching the records to restore the broken and obliterated tombstones and like a skilfull scientist who from a few bones can rebuild a mammoth in its pristine form, he is gradually deciphering the marking on the original graves of George Brent and his wife Mary who was the daughter of Lady Baltimore, as a key to other interpretations. All of the family and their many slaves and Catholics of the riverside for three generations from 1698, the first date until 1798, found a resting place in this hallowed ground. When these graves have been restored and the annals of the chapel regathered from the scattered members of the Brent family, an unknown chapter of Catholic history in Virginia can be written.

Fr. John Carroll on taking over parochial duties in 1774 from his mother's home at Rock Creek, included Acquia on the estate of William Brent Esquire, of Richland, among his permanent missions. When the Declaration of Independence gave Catholics equal rights with their neighbors the chapel of Acquia is named in the visitations assigned to the first priests who attended the country districts along the Potomac and inland to the Rappahannock. Inferentially this is strong proof that the chapel was a recognized place of Catholic worship in pre-revolutionary years though a burning controversy has already arisen over the mere assertion that previous to 1776 there was any sort of Catholic church or chapel in Virginia. Much digging into family annals remains to be done before adequate history of Virginia's oldest place of Catholic worship can be written. But that its site has been purchased by the Bishop of Richmond is a happy omen. He has already to his credit two admirable achievements along historical lines. He was indirectly the agent through which the Catholic patriot and engineer, Major Pierre Charles L'Enfant was taken from a neglected grave and buried with military honors at Arlington. He discovered the clause in the will of Richard Queen through which the Archdiocese of Baltimore would become permanent owners of the property on which the hollowed Queen's chapel and graveyard were situated. Through his efforts and inspiration money was raised to build the lovely little rural church of St. Frances de Sales in the village of Langdon on the same spot where the colonial chapel of the Queens had been placed more than a hundred years before.

MARGARET BRENT DOWNING.

CHRONICLE

At the solemn inauguration of the academic year at the University of Louvain held during the last days of October, the Rector, Mgr. Ladeuze, sang Solemn Mass of the Holy Ghost, in the presence of a great throng of students and professors who filled St. Peter's Church.

At the conclusion of the religious ceremony the inaugural exercises were held in the College of the Pope. Mgr. Ladeuze presided, and gave a most impressive discourse. He spoke of the joy to be derived from intellectual work in the University, exalting truth and stressing the idea of character formation of students.

The second part of his discourse was still more important. Mgr. Ladeuze recorded the grave questions which had divided nations and individual souls, and recommended the Christian principles of peace. The University of Louvain, said the speaker, was distinctly Catholic and Belgian. These two characteristics were its proudest boast. The University aimed to furnish to its students an education which should fit them for their great social mission.

New courses of lectures and studies are being this year inaugurated at Louvain. During the past year several great celebrations were held in honor of celebrated centenaries and notable personages of the Church, Among these were the Sixth Centenary of St. Thomas, celebrations in honor of Cardinal Bellarmine, of Cardinal Mercier, and finally of the visit of the Apostolic Nuncio, Mgr. Micara.

The Rector made announcement of the gift of 100,000 francs made by an alumnus of the Theological Faculty for a laureate of philosophy, theology and letters.

This year Professor Max Turman of the University of Friburg will hold a course of conferences on industrial legislation and industrial work in France. Georges Goyau will tell the history of the French Missions in Africa from XVII Century to Cardinal Lavigerie.

New courses in metaphysics, the history of the humanities in Belgium, history of music, scholastic rights, education, telegraphy, telephony, and medicine, have also been planned.

The voluminous personal papers of the late John Gilmary Shea, probably the greatest Catholic historian America has produced, have been turned over by his youngest daughter, Miss Emma Isabelle Shea of Elizabeth, N. J., to Dr. Peter Guilday of the Catholic University, president of the American Catholic Historical Society and secretary of the American Catholic Historical Association.

These papers of the man who has been called the "American Bede," and the centenary of whose birth was in July of this year, constitute for the historian one of the choicest bits of archival material, says Dr. Guilday. They include:

Letters from Cardinals McCloskey, Farley and Gibbons, Archbishop Corrigan and the historian E. B. O'Callaghan.

Cardinal Gibbons' "Reminiscences of North Carolina," written in 1891, in the Cardinal's handwriting.

Manuscripts of poems written by Mr. Shea on Christmas, 1863.

Manuscripts of a short manual-form complete history of the Jesuits in the United States.

Letters regarding the famous Sir John James Fund in which the English nobleman, about 1750, left certain sums in perpetuity for the upkeep of the Church in Pennsylvania.

Notes on the Negro Plot in New York and on the New England captives.

Varied correspondence covering 100 years of history, gathered for his greatest work.

Pope Pius XI issued a special encyclical for the celebration of the Sixteenth Centenary of the great Basilica of St. John Lateran, which took place on November 9. It was on this date in the year 324 that the original Basilica was dedicated and named the "Basilica of Christ the Saviour," as the Cathedral of the Popes. It was, and is, called the "Mother and Head of all the Churches of the City and of the World."

In a letter addressed to Cardinal Pompili Archpriest of the Lateran and Vicar General to His Holiness, the Pope outlined the reasons for his desire that the centenary be fittingly commemorated. He mentions that the Lateran in His Cathedral as Pope also happens to be the church in which he was ordained to the priesthood.

He then recounted how the Palace of the Lateran was given by the Emperor Constantine the Great to Pope Militiades to be used as the latter's residence, hence the Lateran is a symbol of the conversion from paganism to the Faith of Christ of the Roman Emperor.

The letter recalled how for ten centuries Catholic faith and unity radiated from the Lateran. All great events of that period either began or ended there. Synods of great importance and five Ecumenical Councils were held there. The last two Councils dealt with the redemption of the Holy Land. Gregory the Great instituted his famous school of music in the Lateran and it was from this Cathedral that Augustine and his comrades were sent forth to convert Great Britain.

Expressing regret that He could not be present in person at the celebration the Pope directed His Vicar to make the necessary preparations. He had directed among other things, that the famous statue of the Saviour be taken from the Sancta Sanctorum and placed in the Basilica during the celebration.

Under the Emperor Nero there lived in Rome a wealthy family of the name of Laterani. They possessed a sumptuous house near the spot where now rises the Basilica of St. John.

A member of this family, however, took part in the celebrated plot, against the Emperor, and the palace was confiscated by right of succession until finally it fell into the hands of Fausta, daughter of Maximus and

wife of the Emperor Constantine. Shortly after, the miracle of the fiery cross in the heavens which appeared to Constantine took place, and he was converted to Christianity. Constantine also had visions of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and subsequently all his followers were converted to Christ.

Shortly afterward the valiant conqueror entered Rome in triumph. He determined to dedicate a basilica in the Eternal City to the new cult which he had happily embraced. During the consecration of this basilica, again the luminous Cross appeared in the sky.

This basilica where the First Council was convoked in which the sanctity of the Catholic faith was affirmed, was named for Constantine. After the Fourth Century it received the added title of Sts. John Baptist and Evangelist. To-day it is called St. John Lateran.

Six times this famous edifice was destroyed, by fire, by earthquakes, by barbarian invasions. Six times it was rebuilt. However the famous statue of the Saviour preserved in it was never destroyed, although it had been there from the beginning. It has always been the object of great veneration.

The principal façade of the edifice is that which guards the Plazza of the Holy Cross; it was constructed by order of Pope Clement XII. Between the two central columns is the inscription:

"The Most Holy Lateran Church, Mother and Head of all the churches of the City and of the World."

One of the most celebrated Feasts kept in this church is that of St. John which falls on June 24.

Pope Pius XI, like Leo XIII, is a great humanist, enamoured of classical studies, and especially of the Latin language, which he extolled in a recent letter on the studies of the clergy. He even asserted that it seemed to have been framed and prepared by Providence itself, as an instrument of the university and the indefectibility of the Roman Church.

This love of the classics he has now proved by a new *motu proprio* whereby he founds at the Gregorian University a chair of Latin Literature. The course will last two years, and the students, if successful, will be given a diploma, which the Pope desires to be a title of preference in the competitive examinations for Ecclesiastical Offices. Besides this, the Pope will offer, every year, a gold medal to be competed for by the students.

The lectures will be open to all, even to laymen, and a first professor has been appointed in the person of Fr. E. Costa, S.J.

Great joy has been caused among Italian Catholics by the formal recognition by Royal Decree, in conformity with the law of September 30, 1923, of the legal position of the Catholic University of Milan.

By this Royal Decree the University is definitely placed in the category of free superior educational institutions; its diplomas and degrees now have full legal effect, and their value in all points will be equal to the diplomas and degrees of the royal universities.

The idea of establishing a Catholic university in Italy dates from ex-

actly fifty years ago. At the first Italian Catholic Congress held in Venice in 1874 the idea of a Catholic university was first mooted, and since then resolutions to that effect have been carried in almost all subsequent congresses. Owing to the generosity of the Italian Catholics, great and small, throughout the Peninsula, the project has at length been happily realized.

Much of the undoubted success, both of the agitation for recognition and of the work of the University during the past two or three years, is owing to the learned and indefatigable Rector Magnificus, Padre Agostine Gemelli, O.F.M., who is one of the leading biologists and theologians of Italy.

Dr. Giuseppia Pastori, the lady lecturer assistant to Padre Gemelli, has just been awarded the Wassermann Prize of 5,000 lire reserved for medical graduates, in recognition of her important work in biology carried on during the past few years in the laboratories of the Catholic University itself.

Dr. Dana Carleton Munro writing on "The American Schools of Oriental Research," in *America*, November 1, says:

> The work now carried on under the corporation which bears the name that stands at the head of this article, had its beginning with the opening of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, in the year 1900. The idea of establishing such a school was first proposed in December, 1895, by the late Professor J. H. Thayer, of Harvard University, in his presidential address before the Society of Biblical Literature. The organization adopted after the subject had been fully canvassed was an association supported by annual contributions of $100 a year each from various colleges, universities and theological seminaries. A few individuals also contributed. A director was selected each year from the faculty of one of the contributing institutions, and in this way the School was carried on until the outbreak of the World War in 1914. During this time a number of the leading Semitic and Biblical scholars in the United States acted as Directors of the School. Professors Torrey and Bacon of Yale, Lyon of Harvard, R. F. Harper of Chicago, G. A. Barton of Bryn Mawr, and J. A. Montgomery of the University of Pennsylvania, served, among others, in this way.
>
> From 1914 to 1919 the work of the School was necessarily interrupted by conditions created by war. In 1920 Dr. W. F. Albright was appointed permanent Director of the School, a position which he still holds and in which he is doing excellent service. An annual professor is still sent each year from one of the supporting institutions and Professor R. Butin, of the Catholic University of America, is under appointment as the professor for the year 1925-1926. During the quarter of a century of the life of

this school, a large number of brilliant students have passed through it, gaining an understanding of Holy Scripture that only life in the land of the Bible could give them, as well as much inspiration for their work. Many of them are now filling influential positions as professors and pastors in various parts of the United States.

In 1913 Professor Barton, of Bryn Mawr, proposed that a similar school for the study of Mesopotamian archaeology be established at Bagdad, and a committee for that purpose was appointed by the Council of the Archeological Institute of America. Later Dr. William Hayes Ward, who died in 1916, bequeathed his scientific library to such a school if it were founded within ten years of his death. In 1921 the Executive Committee of the School in Jerusalem and the Mesopotamian Committee appointed by the Archaelogical Institute combined, and were incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia under the name "The American Schools of Oriental Research." It was the design of this corporation to conduct both the School in Jerusalem and one at Bagdad, and possibly in the future should need arise, to establish schools in other centers. After the death of the late Professor Jastrow, in 1921, Mrs. Jastrow presented his library to the American Schools. It was divided, the Biblical books going to Jerusalem, and the books on Mesopotamian matters to Bagdad.

The late Dr. and Mrs. James B. Nies bequeathed $50,000 to the School in Jerusalem with which to erect a building on land purchased in 1909. Plans for this building have already been drawn and it is expected that it will be built within the next two years.

Dr. Nies also made the School at Bagdad his residuary legatee, although his brothers have the use of his residuary estate during their life time. Ultimately, however, the School at Bagdad will come into possession of a large fund for its archeological work. Professor Barton has been appointed Director of the School at Bagdad and Professor A. T. Clay its first Annual Professor. In the autumn of 1923 Professor Clay went to Mesopotamia with two students, and formally opened the School.

The aim of these Schools is two-fold: first, they are intended to afford opportunity for students to study the Bible and biblical archeology in Bible lands; and second, as soon as funds permit, to undertake excavations and publication with a view of making additions to knowledge. Up to the present time they have been able to do little of this, owing to lack of funds. A number of minor investigations, however, have been undertaken and some good work accomplished. The most important of these efforts was the excavation of Tel-el-Ful, the site of the Gibeah of King

Saul, in the year 1922-1923. As soon as funds are available it is intended to undertake much larger tasks.

The School is at present supported by fifty universities, colleges and theological seminaries, scattered from Maine to California, and by a few patrons. They represent all shades of religious thought. The Catholic University of America at Washington is at present the only Catholic institution on this list. It should be added, however, that Professor Herman E. Heuser, of St. Charles Borromeo, Overbrook, Pennsylvania, has become a life-member of the corporation in virtue of having contributed $1000 towards its work. It is to be greatly desired that more Catholics take an interest in this work. The advantage of this to the work itself was strikingly demonstrated by the results of the joint expedition of the School at Jerusalem and Xenia Theological Seminary to the Ghor, south of the Dead Sea. Père Alois Mallon, Director of the Pontifical Biblical School in Jerusalem, an expert in prehistoric archeology, accompanied this expedition. It was due to his presence that the most important discovery of the whole undertaking was made. This was no less than a "high place" of the late Stone Age situated at Ader, on the eastern slope of the Ghor south of the Dead Sea. This "high place" is archeologically almost unique, and but for the presence of Père Mallon it would have been overlooked.

A mural tablet is to be erected at Abbott's Langley, Herts., to commemorate the birth near there of Nicholas Breakspeare, the only Englishman who ever became Pope.

The tablet will be placed in the parish church, in which, it is thought, Nicholas Breakspeare was baptized.

It is hoped to get a well-known Catholic layman to unveil the tablet. It has been noted that the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and also Cardinal Gasquet and Mgr. Mann—a noted historian of the Popes—have expressed their interest in the proposal.

The village school children will take part in a pageant depicting scenes from the life of Pope Adrian IV, written and arranged by Mr. and Mrs. Dawes.

Nicholas Breakspeare reigned in the See of Peter, as Pope Adrian IV, from 1154 to 1159. He was the son of a peasant.

It is interesting to note that there is no Catholic church to-day at Abbot's Langley.

The tablet is to be erected by the Hertfordshire branch of the Historical Association, a non-sectarian society. The branch has only one Catholic member.

The suggestion thus to honour Pope Adrian IV came from the branch president, Mr. F. S. Marvin, H.M., Chief Inspector of History for the Board of Education.

Having decided to erect the tablet, the branch choose the parish church

because it was probably the scene of Nicholas Breakspeare's baptism. It was built about the time of his infancy, and Bedmond, the actual birthplace, is but a short distance away.

The history of the Irish Brigade in the service of France, upon which M. Albert Depreaux is engaged, will soon be ready for publication. For the purpose of the compilation access to the official archives has been given to the author by the French Government. M. Depreaux is one of the most distinguished of French military historians.

He is librarian and vice-president of the Foundation Thiers, a research College endowed for the assistance of scholars in every field of knowledge. The Irish Brigades who fought in the service of France were comprised of members of leading Catholic families who had to flee from their own country.

The century-old controversy over the nationality of Christopher Columbus has come to the fore again through the pronouncement recently at a meeting of the Anglo-Spanish Society of London by Col. W. R. Mansfield that Columbus was a Spaniard and not an Italian, as more popularly believed.

Col. Mansfield has been engaged in extensive research and says he is prepared to upset the popular conception of the early life of Columbus. He asserted in his lecture that the Italian documents which heretofore have supported the belief concerning the great discoverer's nationality are forgeries, so clumsily executed he wonders that historians have failed to realize their worthlessness.

On the other hand, he declared that documents which have been occasionally advanced to prove the pure Spanish blood in Columbus' veins are not spurious, but real proof of his nationality, and that he was born at Pontavedra, in Galicia, Spain.

The indefatigable Georges Goyau, of the French Academy, has an article of special historic interest in the recently published *Revue d'Histoire des Missions*. M. Goyau is President of the Editorial Board of the periodical.

La Belgique catholique a récemment inauguré des Semaines de «Missiologie», où des Missionnaires échangent leurs expériences, et dessinent les conclusions qui s'en dégagent; Louvain, ce beau foyer religieux de culture intellectuelle, est le siège de ces Semaines. L'Institut Catholique de Paris, en l'hiver 1923-1924, a organisé une série de conférences sur les missions, que publie son *Bulletin*, et qui seront bientôt réunies en volume. Au centre même de l'unité, à Rome, se prépare, pour 1925, l'exposition missionnaire, qui veut être un tableau vivant de la civilisation en marche, —en marche avec le Christ et par le Christ L'Allemagne catholique, enfin peu de temps avant la Grande Guerre, voulut instituer une discipline nouvelle qu'elle appela la «science des Missions» le professor Schmidlin, a Münster, fonda ia *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, pour en être

l'organe. L'Allemagne apportait, dans ces études, son esprit d'ambition scientifique, mis au service de l'impérialisme national; il ne lui déplaisait pas de dire au monde chrétien: *Germania docet.* Mais toutes réserves faites sur cette tendance, la Revue de M. Schmidlin a fourni, dés ses débuts, de très utiles, contributions à l'histoire de l'apostolat chrétien; elle a mis en relief, en de féconds raccourcis, les services réciproques que peuvent et doivent se rendre la science des races et celle des Missions; elle s'est attachée à montrer ce que doivent à l'effort des missionnaires les diverses connaissances humaines, et comment, inversement, ils en peuvent tirer parti; et si le mot de *Cultur* n'avait été deux fois profané par l'Allemagne du *Culturkampf* et par l'Allemagne de 1914, volontiers marquerions-nous l'importance de la *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* en disant que les missions, telles qu'elle s'est proposée de les étudier, apparaissent comme un vaste et complexe phénomène de *Cultur*, digne d'intéresser, non seulement les âmes pieuses et croyantes, mais tous les spectateurs du progrès humain.

Il convient que le public français, ais possède un organe qui vise à montrer, par des traxaux de détail et par des études d'ensemble, la place que doivent occuper dans l'histoire générale l'idée de mission et le labeur missionnaire.

Trop souvent cette place est méconnue, et c'est pour la science historique un grand malheur. Des travaux d'approche s'ébauchent, des contacts s'installent, des pénétrations réciproques s'opèrent; de l'observation de tous ces faits résulte l'histoire de la civilisation; et lorsqu'elle nous montre l'Occident du moyen âge cognant aux portes de l'Orient, l'Europe du XVI^e^ siécle cognant aux portes de l'Amérique, elle déclare, et non sans raison, que ces épisodes de la vie des peuples ont souvent plus d'intérêt, et plus de portée, que le jeu des compétitions dynastiques. Mais dans ces épisodes, quels sont les grads acteurs? Ce sont les marchands, ce sont les missionnaires.

Les marchands, au cours de leurs exodes, portent avec eux certains rudiments de civilisation, mais aussi des vices,—ces vices des sociétés avancés, dont les missionnaires déplorerent longtemps avant Rousseau, la transplantation chez les sauvages: ce n'est pas parmi les marchands qu'il faut en général chercher des messagers, conscients et méthodiques, de la civilisation occidentale et chrétienne; la cause finale de leur activité, c'est d'introduire des objets de commerce, et non point d'introduire un message.

Tout au contraire, les missionnaires, de par leur vocation, de par l'élan qui les pousse, de par la consigne qu'ils ont reçue, sont des professionnels de l'œuvre civilisatrice. S'ils propagent, par exemple, les connaissances agricoles, c'est parce qu'il est de leur office et de leur devoir d'être les interprètes du Dieu créateur, qui mit la terre à la disposition des hommes pour qu'ils la cultivassent; s'ils travaillent à déraciner l'esclavage, ou bien la polygamie c'est parce qu'il est de leur office et de leur devoir d'être les annonciateurs de l'esprit de l'Evangile; et s'ils aspirent enfin à faire besogne de libérateurs, c'est parce qu'il est de leur office et de leur devoir d'être docteurs de vérité, de la vérité qui délivre. L'accomplissement

même de leur ministère pastoral les érige en agents de civilisation. Voilà ce qu'il faut inculquer, par des textes et par des faits, á nombre d'esprits qui volontiers ne verraient dans les missionnaires que de pieux propagandistes s'essayant à disséminer sous de lointaines latitudes, avec leurs idées personnelles sur l'au-delà, quelques pratiques de dévotion. Si les missionnaires n'étaient rien de plus, ils intéresseraient, peut-être, l'histoire anecdotique; mais l'histoire générale pourrait passer à côté de leurs efforts, sans les noter. Sous peine de se mutiler, sous peine de s'appauvrir, l'histoire générale doit s'occuper d'eux; ils ont droît à son attention; ils comptent parmi les plus importants facteurs de ces évolutions humaines dont à travers les siècles elle scande les laborieuses étapes.

Un Auguste Comte, qu'on veuille bien le remarquer, serait ici pleinement d'accord avec nous: car dès lors qu'il admet l'état théologique comme un premier stade de civilisation, il ne pourrait refuser aux missionnaires, représentants par excellence de l'état théologique, une gloire de précurseurs, de devanciers, de fourriers, dans les terres vierges où ils s'installent, auprès des âmes vierges qu'ils abordent. Et cette gloire, siècle par siècle, l'histoire générale doit l'enregistrer. Abstraction faite de tout intérêt proprement national, les missionnaires, par le fait même de leur tâche sacerdotale, jouent un rôle dans le développement intellectuel et moral de l'humanité; oublier ce rôle, ou bien l'atténuer, ce serait méconnaître l'efficacitè agissante de l'idée et l'emprise de l'idée sur les faits; ceserait déférer à je ne sais quelle conception matérialiste de l'histoire, égalament dédaigneuse des droits de l'homme et des droits de Dieu, et systématiquement encline à ne voir, dans toutes les complexités des rapports humains, que de brutaux conflits d'intérêts, où pèricliterait fatalement la dignité de l'homme, ou péricliterait fatalement sa liberté.

Il est un autre aspect sous lequel les annales des missionnaires doivent intéresser l'histoire générale. Dans la vaste unité chrétienne, telle que le moyen âge la concevait, les diverses nations ont chacune leur fonction, j'allais dire leur ministère; elles sont, dans le corps de la chrétienté, membres les unes des autres, et servent avec leurs dons respectifs, avec leurs aptitudes propres, la vérité suprême qui est leur commun patrimonie, à toutes. Inévitablement, elles gardent leur personnalité de nations, dans les terrains de mission qui leur sont dévolus pour qu'elles y fassent régner l'Evangile; inévitablement, elles introduisent sur ces terrains, en même temps que l'Evangile, l'influence de leur esprit, et celle de leur langue. A l'écart et au-dessous de cet idéal supranational qui est l'idéal primordial et demeure l'idéal ultime de toute oeuvre missionnaire, certains résultats secondaires sont obtenus, résultats d'ordre politique, qui sont comme la récompense humaine, terrestre, du zèle dépensé par les nations pour le service divin. Les missionnaires cherchent le règne de Dieu, et cette récompense, dont bénéficie leur patrie, leur est donnée par surcroît.

Il ne fut pas inutile à l'expansion française que nos prêtres des Missions Etrangères, dès le dix-septième siècle, implantassent le nom de la France dans l'Extrême-Orient, ou que nos Maristes promenassent leur apostolat dans le Pacifique quinze ans avant l'installation de nos trois

couleurs en Nouvelle Calédonie il ne fut pas inutile á l'expansion française que l'action de Lavigerie, en Tunisie précédât nos initiatives politiques, et qu'Augouard, au Congo, pécédât Brazza. Ainsi considérée, l'histoire des missions devient une page de l'histoire nationale, une page qu'on n'a pas le droit de laisser s'effacer, ou d'écrire avec une encre pâlie.

Lorsqu'on lit l'*Histoire contemporaine de la France* d'Ernest Lavisse, on est surpris qu'en cette synthèse à beaucoup d'égards remarquable, l'effort missionnaire de la France aux dix-neuvième et vingtième siècles demeure à peu près inaperçu. Qu'en rèsulte-t-il? C'est qu'en fermant ces neuf volumes, on garde une impression trés vive des luttes de l'Eglise contre l'Etat—luttes devant l'opinion publique, luttes à la tribune parlementaire, —et qu'on n'emporte aucune connaissance ni même aucune idée de ce que fit l'Eglise pour l'expansion de la vie nationale. Nous y voyons se dresser l'Eglise, de temps à autre, comme une antagoniste des pouvoirs officiels, mais jamais comme une collaboratrice de la grandeur française, en Asie, en Afrique, en Océanie: la part magnifique prise par l'Eglise de France à l'épanouissement national de la France disparaît. Si l'histoire des missions acquérait l'importance qui lui est due, on n'aurait pas à constater, dans une œuvre aussi magistrale, aussi légitimement appréciée, une aussi regrettable lacune.

En dépit et à l'encontre d'un certain laïcisme qui considère comme une sorte d'intrusion de l'élément spirituel dans les intérêts terrestres tous les résultats politiques dus à l'action de l'Eglise, on ne saurait méconnaître ce fait, que la politique coloniale des nations chrétiennes trouva dans les missionnaires d'actifs auxiliaires, et qu'au demeurant, par l'esprit même dont s'animait leur collaboration, ils contribuaient à orienter cette politique vers certaines fins supérieures à l'égoïsme national, en invitant les nations colonisatrices à faire l'éducation des peuplades colonisées. Ainsi se mêle à l'histoire de ces personnalités collectives qui sont les nations l'histoire de ces organismes supra-nationaux que sont les missions; et dans cette fusion même se pacifie l'apparent conflit qui parut parfois mettre aux prises, au cours des âges, l'idée de nationalité et l'idée de chrétienté. L'histoire des patries, comme l'histoire de la civilisation humaine, doit faire une place à celle des missions; en travaillant pour celle-ci, c'est pour la science historique tout entière que l'on travaille.

With the recent appearance of the fourteenth English volume, seven of the German volumes of Pastor's monumental work—*History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, have now been completely translated and edited by Father R. F. Kerr. The publishers are Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., London.

Two reviewers of the Catholic University of America publications, in the London *Tablet*, say: "The Catholic University of America is laying the learned world under heavy obligations." Both refer to recently published volumes of Patristic Studies under the direction of Dr. Roy Deferrari, of the School of Letters.

Statistics published by the *Postier Catholique* reveal that eleven thousand towns, cities and villages of France bear the names of saints.

Saint Martin is the most popular, being godfather to 247 villages. Next comes Saint John, with 169.

There are also numerous places bearing the name of Notre Dame, while others bear such religious names as Dieu-le-Fit (God made It); Dieu-le-Garde (God Guard It); Dieu-le-Veut (God Wills It), Ville-dieu, etc.

The Abbot of St. Vincent's Abbey, Beatty, Pa., has decided to open a monastery in Pekin and to found the desired Catholic University, which it is hoped will do much to dispel the harm already done by Bolshevik doctrines and propaganda. One of the Fathers is now in Rome, arranging the details of the new Foundation.

The publication of the first number of the *Commonweal*, "a weekly review of literature, the arts and public affairs" marks the beginning of an attempt to apply "the conserving and regenerative forces of the fountain head of Christian tradition, experience and culture to the problem that to-day all men of good will are seeking to solve." The new venture deserves the support, moral and financial, of all who are interested in propagating the principles that can regenerate the world. The CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW offers hearty welcome to the *Commonweal* and cherishes the hope that it meet with the success which it deserves.

A notable centenary passed practically unobserved and unnoticed in October. October 20th was the four hundredth anniversary of the death of one of the world's greatest physicians and one of mankind's greatest benefactors, Thomas Linacre, Doctor of Medicine of the University of Padua, and founder of the Royal College of Physicians of England.

Linacre, who was a priest as well as a physician, was born of poor parents, and received his early education from one of the famous monastery schools of England. In 1484 at the age of twenty-four he was elected a fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.

He travelled to Italy and entered the household of Lorenzo de Medici, and there was a fellow student of Lorenzo's sons, one of whom afterward became Pope Leo X. In Italy under Politian and Demetrius Chalcondylas, two of the most accomplished professors of the Renaissance, he acquired a knowledge of languages that made him one of the foremost humanistic scholars of England. After receiving his degree in medicine from the University of Padua, he returned home and became after years of distinguished practice in medicine, physician to King Henry VIII, and regular medical attendant of the highest nobility of the country.

After eleven years of distinguished service in medicine, Linacre in 1520 resigned his position as royal physician and became a priest.

In 1509 he was made rector of Mersham and prebend of Wells; in 1518, prebend and in 1519, precentor in York Cathedral.

Linacre was a voluminous writer. His most celebrated works are his Latin translations from Galen, among which are: *De Temperamentis* (1521); *De Tuenda Sanitate* (1517); *De Methodo Medendi* (1519). His other works are a translation of *Proculus de Sphâera; De Emendata Structura Latini Sermonis* (1524). His chief title to remembrance rests upon his scholarship and his connection with Erasmus and Blessed Thomas More who were among his pupils at Oxford, where with Grocyn and Latimer he was the first to teach Greek.

Noting a remarkable historic gathering at the London Guildhall, the *Universe* (Nov. 14) says:

Gog and Magog, the two wooden giants who for more than two centuries have looked down on many historic gatherings at the Guildhall, were solemn witnesses on Monday night of something without parallel in their history.

A Catholic Lord Mayor of London and two Catholic Sheriffs entertained His Majesty's Ministers and a brilliant assemblage of the King's most distinguished citizens at the historic banquet.

Within memory of middle-aged folk Catholics were held up to public scorn. On Monday the City of London gave its credit and its dignity into the keeping of three Catholics. Hundreds of thousands of Londoners thronged the City streets to cheer the new Lord Mayor and his Sheriffs, and the traditional Show was one of the most notable in recent history. It included a representation of St. Martin, the patron of the Vintners' Company, to which Sir Alfred Bower belongs.

His Eminence Cardinal Bourne was cheered loudly at the Guildhall reception.

For the first time in the City's history Catholic Press representatives were invited by the City Remembrancer, on behalf of the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs, to the famous banquet. Two papers, including the *Universe*, were thus honoured.

On December 19 His Eminence Cardinal Gasquet celebrated the Golden Jubilee of his ordination to the priesthood. The occasion was celebrated by the Cardinal's friends in England by a suitable presentation. The venerable prelate is still, as he claims, "youthful."

He was born in London in 1846, educated at Downside College, and in 1878-84 was superior of the Benedictine monastery and college of St. Gregory at Downside. He afterwards became abbot president of the English Benedictines, president of the International Commission for the Revision of the Vulgate, and (1914) Cardinal. Among his important publications are: *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* (1888-89; 2nd. ed. 1906); *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* (1890); *The Last Abbot of Glastonbury* (1895; 2nd. ed., 1908); *A Sketch of Monastic Constitutional History* (1896); *The Old English Bible* (1897; new ed., 1908); *The Eve of the Reformation* (1900); *A Short History of the Catholic Church in England* (1903); *Vita antiquissima B. Gregorii Magni* (1903);

Collectio Anglo-Premonstratensia (1904 et seq.); *English Monastic Life* (1904); *Henry III and the Church* (1905); *Lord Acton and His Circle* (1906); *Parish Life in Mediaeval England* (1906); *The Greater Abbeys of England* (1908); *The Black Death of 1348 and 1349* (2nd. ed., 1908); *England Under the Old Religion* (1912); *Breaking With the Past* (1914).

Anent the statements made by certain sections of the press in this country and on the other side of the Atlantic, the following editorial comment by the *Universe* (London) is of great significance:

> If it be suggested that there is the slightest doubt about the broad facts of the religious persecution in Russia, and of the principles that inspire that persecution, we can refer our readers to a series of documents that stand quite unassailable—the publications of the Pontificial Oriental Institute in Rome, issued under the auspices of its learned President, Fr. D'Herbigny, S. J., and obtainable from the Institute, 35, Piazza Pilotta, Rome, for the absurdly low subscription of 20 francs a year.
>
> These publications are the very antithesis of anything that can be described as a "newspaper stunt." The object of the Pontifical Oriental Institute is simply the reconciliation of the schismatic East to Catholic unity. In the pursuit of that object it was, of course, necessary to acquire full and accurate information of the actual state of affairs in the East—the fortunes and misfortunes of the Eastern Christians, as well as their ecclesiastical tenets.
>
> With all the accuracy and caution, therefore, of the scholar, publishing his results in the face of adverse critics, the publications of the Institute are drawn up. Original sources are in all cases the authorities relied upon, and the fullest references to those sources are in every case given. No body of evidence could be more objective or more conclusive.
>
> The last publication of the Institute lies before us, the first fascicule of the third volume of *Orientalia Christiana*, and it deals with the latest phases of the religious life of the Russians under the Soviet persecution of Christianity. Former volumes, as well as various publications of Père D'Herbigny, had told the story of the earlier phases.
>
> From the documents here digested and presented two facts emerge, proved beyond possibility of doubt. One is that the rejection of Christianity—and, indeed, of all religion, is an integral part of the Communistic theory as held by the Soviet State. The other is that such rejection of Christianity and of religion is carried out as a practical policy, ruthlessly and with every circumstance of aggravation.
>
> As to the former point, it is impossible to reproduce in a popular journal facts which Père D'Herbigny can print in a learned

periodical of limited circulation. They are too outrageous and abominable to be laid in their nakedness before our readers. Blasphemous indecency is one of the weapons used to arouse the passions of the vicious against that religion which is, in the forefront, the guardian of morality.

And the principles laid down are no private speculations of individual controversalists. They are developed in publications issued officially by the Soviet Government, and marked "edition gouvernementale." Here are laid down categorically the principles that Communism and any religion at all are irreconcilable, that all religion is to be rooted out from education, and "the children liberated from the reactionary influences of their parents," and that "the struggle against the religious prejudices of the masses" is a task to be strenuously and unremittingly pursued.

And as to the practical application of these principles, the evidence is as conclusive. Not to speak of the treatment of Catholics—the murder of Mgr. Budkiewicz, the condemnation and imprisonment of Mgr. Cieplak, and the other outrages of which our readers are well aware—no less than twenty-five, or perhaps, twenty-eight, native Russian Bishops of the Schismatic Church have been butchered; others have died in prison; nearly thirteen hundred priests are known to have been massacred in a single year. And these are only a few outstanding figures verifiable amidst a welter of blood of which no one knows the real proportions.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Origins of the Islamic State, being a translation from the Arabic accompanied with annotations, geographic and historic notes of the Kitab Fūthu al-Buldān of al-Imām abu-l 'Abbās Ahmed ibn-Jābir al-Baladhuri by Francis Clark Murgotten, Ph.D.; Part II of vol. LXVIII of Studies in History, Economics and Public Law edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University New York. Columbia University Press, 1924.

In this volume Dr. Murgotten gives the English translation of Part II (sections XI-XXI) of the *Kitāb Futūh al-Buldān* (i. e. *The Book of the Conquest of the Countries)* of the Arabic historian Balādhuri (+ 892), Part I, which was done into English by Dr. Philip Khuri Hitti, in 1916, deals with the wars of Mohammed against the Jews, against Mecca and Taif, and with the invasion of Syria, Armenia, Egypt and Northern Africa. Part II relates the conquest of Persia and adjoining lands, province by province, in this order: Northern Media, Adharbaijan, Mosul, Jurjan and Tabaristan, the district of the Tigris, Khuzistan, Fars and Kirman, Sigistan and Kabul, Khurasan and as-Sind. This is followed by five interesting appendices: Laws concerning the Kharādj lands, that is, the lands subject to taxation, the history of the 'Atā' or pension system in the caliphate of Omar, the use of the seal in public documents, the Coinage and the Art of Writing. This translation, as well as that by Dr. Hitti, is based on the Arabic text published at Leyden in 1866 by the famous Dutch orientalist De Goeje and reprinted at Cairo in 1900. The author informs us that, with one exception, no emendations or alterations of the text as edited have been made or adopted other than those included by that great Arabic scholar in his notes, and that, in cases where the text is not clear or the facts as stated are seriously at variance with other trustworthy sources, references have been given to the more important Arabic historians and geographers. Dr. Murgotten has performed his very difficult task with great exactness and care; thanks are due him for having made available to the general public one of the most reliable accounts of the origins of Islam

and his work is of the utmost importance to those interested in this period of the world's history.

A. VASCHALDE.

History of the Franks, by Gregory, Bishop of Tours. Selections translated with Notes by Ernest Brehaut, Ph.D. (Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies.) New York: Columbia University Press. Pp. xxv+284.

Gregory's *History of the Franks* is of fundamental importance for students of the history of social institutions in Western Europe because of the information that can be gleaned from it relating to the fusion of Gallo-Roman and Frankish cultures. The author, who was born at Clermont in Auvergne in 538, spent virtually his entire life in the Loire valley, the southern limit of Frankish colonization; from 573 till his death twenty-one years later he lived at Tours. He belonged to an important and influential family; of the bishops of Tours from the beginning all but five were his kinsmen, and other sees also were held by his relatives.

In the present volume about one half of the *History* is translated in 248 pages, the structure of the original being preserved; some chapters are given in full, others are summarized—with or without illustrative extracts—and yet others are given by title only. Fourteen pages of selections from the *Books of Miracles* follow, chosen to show Gregory's personality and point of view. For the assistance of the general reader there are thirteen pages of notes, three genealogical tables, a map of the Frankish dominions, and an index of proper names; a short bibliography points the way to further study.

Once the utility of translating selections from primary sources is granted, the production of such a work as this is amply justified. The selections have been discriminatingly chosen, and, apart from some typographical blunders, the workmanship displayed is that of a competent scholar. Yet the reviewer must express the hope that this will be but a first installment, and that Dr. Brehaut will some day give us a complete translation of Gregory's *History*. Other than that we are here given too little, the only criticism to offer would seem to be that the Intro-

duction, admirable in some respects, is somewhat marred by an occasional flippancy of tone.

ALFRED H. SWEET.

Recent Problems in Admiralty Jurisdiction. By Edgar Tremlett Fell, Ph.D. Johns Hopkins University Studies, Series XL, No. 3. The Johns Hopkins Press, 1922. Pp. 136.

Dr. Fell divides his paper into three parts: The Constitutionality of State Legislation affecting Admiralty and Maritime Matters; Jurisdictional Immunity of Public Vessels and Goods; and Jurisdiction over Foreign Private Merchant Vessels and Seamen.

As to the first, he begins by tracing briefly that well-known and interesting struggle both in England and in the United States between the Admiralty and Common Law courts for jurisdiction of matters in the nature maritime, and shows in detail that the practical outcome of that struggle was to make the test of locality the basis for jurisdiction in tort and nature of the transaction the basis for jurisdiction over contracts; (2) that admiralty jurisdiction in the United States came to be over navigable waters as distinguished from the English doctrine that admiralty jurisdiction to all waters which ebb and flow; and (3) that the jurisdiction of State and Federal courts in this country grew out of the extraordinary development of Art. III, Sec. 11, Cl. 1 of our Constitution and of the Judiciary Act with its well known clause "saving to all suitors in all cases the right of a common law remedy where the common law is competent to give it." This devolpment is interspersed with statutes and cases; but the pivot upon which he turns his development is the constitutionality of the divers statutes in the United States from 1789 to the present time. State Workmen's Compensation Acts and the extent of their applicability to maritime torts, State statutes like Lord Campbell's Act for wrongful death, State statutes creating liens for labor and materials furnished foreign vessels, the famous Jensen case (decided by the U. S. Supreme Court on May 21, 1917), which led in the same year to an amendment of the "saving clause" to cover workmen's compensation statutes, and which purported to nullify the Jensen decision, and finally the decision in the case of the Knickerbocker Ice Co. *vs.*

Stewart (253 U. S. 149) holding the amendment unconstitutional are very clearly discussed. Dr. Fell shows that the court in that case treated the "saving clause" as a matter of saving common law remedies, not common law rights; that (rightly) such distinction is objectionable on practical grounds; that many common cases point the other way; and that a new contention arises out of the decision, namely, that common law courts are now vested with a new admiralty jurisdiction, (thereby divesting the Federal courts of their exclusive jurisdiction in such matters). The Federal Death Statute, the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, the Webb-Kenyon Act, and recent legislation relating to seamen are also discussed.

The traditional development of the law as to immunity of public vessels is given in the second part. Here the various kinds of ships and public vessels are separately treated. The Act of 1920 providing for suits against the United States in Admiralty is here discussed; and the basic American Rule making possession or non-possession of the sovereign the test for immunity is contrasted with the English Rule.

In the third part, jurisdiction over foreign private merchant vessels and seamen is developed as to the territorial waters, the high seas, including both civil and criminal jurisdiction. At this point, perhaps, the case of the Appam might have been treated more thoroughly, on account of its significance with regard to an extension of jurisdiction. The modern problems involved in the Harter Act, the Seamen's Act of 1915 (which seems not to coincide with some of our prior international obligations) and some other matters, however, Dr. Fell covers more adequately.

The virtue of this paper lies in the fact that it is a modern development and treatment of this portion of our law by an admirable combination of analysis and history of the decided cases. It is, moreover, a thorough piece of work as to the topics treated. One can but hope that the author may extend his paper to a complete treatment of modern problems in the whole body of Admiralty law. The paper is of much practical value. An index accompanies the text.

FREDERICK DE SLOOVERE.
Georgetown University.

The History of Mother Seton's Daughters. The Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati, Ohio, 1809-1923. By Sister Mary Agnes McCann, M.A., Ph.D. New York: Longmans, Green & Company, London, 1923. Pp. 321.

In this volume Sister Mary Agnes McCann takes up the chronicles of her order from 1870 and brings them to 1923 according to the title, but only to 1897 according to the text. Those readers who have made the journey in the previous volumes, I and II of the same series, will continue their progress far afield both in print and illustrations. Chapters are arranged chronologically and then topically and the book opens with a fascinating account of the Colorado mission, both as to schools and hospitals with a strong light thrown on the subject by means of quotations from the fertile pens of historians of the Rio Grande country. An impressive lesson in economics and the application of the law of supply and demand is furnished in the discussion of the sheep industry and its influence on the past and present history of the Southwest.

Some unusual features may be noted in this book. The author uses her bibliography as a prologue rather than a supplement and this choice proves a wise one. Her sources of information vary widely from those employed to make the foundation even of quasi-historical studies, and are almost wholly derived from manuscript sources, diaries of prelates associated with the "black cap" Sisters of Charity, superiors in the order, letters and official reports and papers which form the archives, while a vast array of Catholic periodicals and secular journals with sermons and lectures are cited. Journalistic authorities except rarely prove of substantial worth, because in the nature of things the newspaper writer has not the time for research work. Sister Mary Agnes McCann has accomplished some notable feats in searching the annals of the past, and it is regrettable that in the present venture she leans so heavily on such slender props.

The index is exceptionally ample, accurate and intelligently arranged. But such praise cannot be given the body of the volume, where epochs are treated rather casually and trivial details in familiar reportorial fashion. Dealing with events of

vital significance in the annals of these black cap sisters during the formative period of Catholic parochial education and in which they played a major rôle, the patience is severely tried to find persistently wedged into weighty narrations that such a clerical guest gave benediction for the community or that such a talented pupil sang such a song for his entertainment. The printing of minor happenings of this nature would be barely permissible in a diary. There are three tabulations of value, those which give a mortuary list from 1809 until 1897 and are useful for readers who admire the vignettes of the heroic daughters of Mother Seton as they flit through the pages. A second will cause gratitude from all those whose duty it is to give statistics and data on the religious foundations of the past half of the 19th century and the opening decades of the 20th. This is a list of the foundations of the order in the past seventy-five years, tersely bracketed and lastly there is a complete list of the members of this order during the years embraced in the title page.

It may be summarized that Sister McCann gives much information not necessarily a part of the history of Mother Seton's Daughters and not, in scores of instances, connected with it by what would be deemed a definite historical link, as for instance that long digression in Chapter XVII when three-fourths of the text is given over to the Vatican Council with only the meagre excuse offered in quoting letters which Archbishop Purcell wrote to the Mother House whilst he was attending that memorable congress. But all information, whether part of the theme or extraneous to it, is told in spirited fashion and will make an impress and must in many cases add to the sum total of useful knowledge. Those on the mountain top view things from a different angle from those in the valley. Sister Mary Agnes has seen life as a whole and this volume will have value in many aspects, other than that which can be understood by its title page.

M. B. D.

The Congregation of St. Joseph at Carondelet. A brief history of its origin and work in the United States (1650-1922). By Sister Mary Lucida Savage, Ph.D. With an introduc tion by Most Rev. John Joseph Glennon, Archbishop of St. Louis. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1923 Pp. 334.

In a felicitious introduction to this chronicle of the initial foundation at Carondelet, Missouri, of this supremely important congregation of St. Joseph, the Archbishop of St. Louis in his concluding sentence gives in tabloid form the lesson contained in these 334 pages, prepared as a dissertation leading to the doctorate by this gifted daughter of the order, Sister Mary Lucida Savage. "Only those who are willing to make sacrifices, only those whose souls are touched with the flame of the spirit, only those who can see high emprise in leaving all to follow Him, only those who realize that there is no solitude where God is, and that no mortal task may claim them when the work of God is to be done," are the foundations on which are laid such noble institutes as stand to the credit of the Sisters of St. Joseph in the new world.

One of the valuable portions of the book is the appendix which contains a minute summary of the extent and scope of the mission which began in 1836 in Carondelet, a humble dependency of St. Louis on the banks of the Mississippi, and which is brought down to the issuing of the volume, 1923. There are literally tens of thousands of pupils under the care of the Sisters of St. Joseph, the Church of the Nativity in Chicago having more than 1,100 and some dozen more other parochial schools counting those enrolled but little short of a thousand. If the advanced classes in these schools scattered in every section of this republic, would include Sister Lucida's study among the text books of history, religion and general culture, the result could scarcely be reckoned in beneficial aspects scholastically with perhaps a spiritual harvest of generous dimension. The human interest which envelopes this story lifts it above the usual run of the chronological routine of religious foundations and the joyous way in which the author follows the beckoning hand into byways and narrates what is of consuming interest at the time and place but not necessarily a part of her narrative, gives this book

an unique value. The reader can learn much of old French St. Louis and of its still more Gallic suburb Carondelet, when Camp Jackson was wrenched from its defenders in 1861 and General Harney swept through the territory with Federal troops and proclaimed martial law. Delicate shades of interpretation play on the heroic figure of Most Rev. John Ireland and the future writer who takes this indomnitable man of the Northwest as a study must read carefully all those portions of this chronicle of the Sisters of St. Joseph in Minnesota which relate to him. History has been made there in several meanings by the Sisters of St. Joseph for theirs was the first regularly equipped hospital in all of Minnesota and this humble foundation continues to-day one of the renowned centres of the healing art in St. Paul, rebuilt in splendor and with every modern equipment. Beginning with St. Louis, the proud metropolis of the Mississippi Valley, civic progress may be traced in a half a hundred centres of population to-day, and the evolution of many states is contained in a kernel of these annals of courage. In the opening chapters a sweeping vision of France in the days when St. Francis de Sales and St. Vincent de Paul enriched the earth is graphically presented, and later there is a spirited picture of France of the Revolution. No better text for historical essays can be assigned than is comprehended in the chapters of this book and for supplementary reading in the higher classes of students. For those who have graduated into life seeking the most remunerative knowledge it will be found of permanent value.

M. B. D.

Bismarck's Diplomacy at Its Zenith. By Joseph Vincent Fuller, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in the University of Wisconsin. Harvard Historical Series, Vol. XXVI. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1922. Pp. xii+368.

The diplomatic history of the Great Powers is a topic to which much attention has been devoted, largely, of late years, in the endeavor to trace out one or another of the lines leading to the catastrophe of 1914. A good deal that has been produced must be classed as *Tendenzschriften*, for as yet we are so near Armageddon that it is extraordinarily difficult to deal with the causes and antecedents of the German War with that impertur-

able objectivity that many writers claim and few possess. In his Preface Dr. Fuller says that he will incur the charge of cutting the new cloth to his old pattern because practically all his early conclusions have been confirmed by the more recently published documents. His book however seems free of the charge of being a mere compilation of evidence amassed to prove a thesis; on the contrary, it is a careful and detailed examination of the foreign policy of imperial Germany under the great Chancellor.

The period which Professor Fuller takes as marking the zenith of Bismarck's diplomacy lies between 25 August, 1885, and 6 February, 1888; its beginning marked by the interview between the Russian and Austrian emperors at Kremsier, and its end by the speech in the Reichstag in which the Chancellor gave so valuable an exposition of his views on foreign policy. This stretch of somewhat less than two and a half years was sufficiently crowded with incident: two crises in Bulgaria, the imminent probability of war with France, strained relations with Russia, perplexities in dealing with Austria and Italy. Nor is it an easy task to trace the course of Bismarck's policy at all times; the "honest broker" was not above destroying the evidence relating to some deal that he failed to put through. The difficulty lies deeper than that. As the author points out: "at no stage of his career are his actions to be interpreted according to any prearranged and inelastic plan. With certain precise ends of national interest ahead, he had always several ways in view by which to reach them, and never allowed one road to be closed to him until success was assured by another, never hesitated to change from one to another if circumstances rendered it advisable..... His policy remains for months in a fluid, elusive state, and takes definite shape only when the end is in sight; yet such as it then emerges, it can be seen to be consistent from the beginning, although always subject to one or more alternative possibilities."

In the controversy between those who feel that the German ship of state crashed on the rocks because after the pilot was dropped another course was steered, and those who think that the new course was the logical continuation of the old, Professor Fuller places himself in the ranks of the latter. All the causes

of the empire's downfall are to be found in Bismarck's own diplomacy, consummate in duplicity and brutality. His conclusion ought not, perhaps, to be thus baldly stated in a brief review; it is not his conclusion that is of primary importance, but the careful and detailed narrative that leads up to it. In brief, Professor Fuller has made a notable contribution to modern European history in a volume that at once enlarges the boundaries of our knowledge and exemplifies the way in which diplomatic history should be treated.

ALFRED H. SWEET.

New Governments of Central Europe. By Malbone W. Graham, Jr., Ph.D., Adjunct Professor of Government, University of Texas, assisted by Robert C. Binkley, M.A., Stanford University. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1924. Pp. x+683.

Professor Graham's Central Europe comprises in the main the territory that was a decade ago occupied by Germany and Austria-Hungary. When revolutions overturned the imperial governments in the last years of the World War, the most distinct of the nationalist groups constituted themselves States and set about establishing governments. The constitutions, which these peoples—the Germans, the Austrians, the Hungarians, the Czechoslavs, and the Jugoslavs—framed, naturally reflect present political attitudes, colored, however, not only by future national hopes, but also by past political experience. These two considerations both limit and determine this study. Poland, the Baltic States, the Ukraine, and the Caucasus are eliminated because their governments did not develop out of the German-Hungarian systems. This limitation inspires the reader with confidence, for only a person possessed of omniscience can pretend to competent knowledge of the inwardness of the Russian, the Soviet-Russian, and the Ottoman systems as well as the Germanic and the Hungarian. We cannot, of course, see how some of these states—he mentions them in his preface—can possibly be regarded as Central European in any sense. Be this as it may the limits which Professor Graham has set himself, enable him "to deal with the governments of Central Europe *en bloc*," and, on the basis of a fairly common historical background, to

study the "forces, military, economic, racial, psychological, that are at work attempting to modify, amend, adapt, restore" their constitutional mechanisms.

Now and then, the author nods. That the Center, or Clerical party was "led by adroit politicians taking their orders from the Vatican" (p. 11), is a Franch contention that is dying hard despite the fact that no one has ever been able to bring forward even such proof for it as serves us for many other points of recent world history. We find, too, the statement that after the Revolution of 1918 the Center Party changed its name to the Christian People's Party (p. 14). The Center Party did not change its name, but divided on the separatist movement. The members who favored the secession of the Rhineland formed the Christian People's Party. The Center Party continued to exist as before, opposing the course of their co-religionists of the Rhineland, and, we suppose, being like them "always an opportunist party" (p. 93). "With shrewder sense," Professor Graham observes, "than the French Clericals under the Third Republic, the party at once professed its conversion to Republicanism and has since that time steadfastly held to it.There has been no endeavor (the italics are reviewer's) *to trifle with the ideals of democracy, but the party has adopted them with as much grace as possible*" (p. 93). Exceptions might also be taken to statements about the Catholic rôle in Austria, and in other countries, but the reader will find a section on "The Vatican and the New States" in the concluding chapter of the book (pp. 401-406), that will summarise for him the strange attitude which the author has taken toward Catholics and their position in Central European politics.

Over one third of the volume is devoted to the presentation of select documents illustrative of the political development of the several countries. Though this selection fails somewhat in the same respect as the text, the reader will go far before he will find as serviceable a collection of source material as this. Six so-called "Time Charts," graphically portraying party oscillations, are another valuable feature of the volume; especially so is the comparative time and party chart, 1918-1924, opposite page 397. The "factual objectivity" of these charts and the "mathematical accuracy" with which they portray "in concrete measur-

able terms the tensile strength, and the duration of strains which a modern government can endure" gives them, Professor Graham believes, a value that can hardly be exaggerated.

FRANCIS J. TSCHAN,
Carnegie Institute,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Our World To-day and Yesterday; a History of Modern Civilization. By James Harvey Robinson and Emma Peters Smith with the collaboration of James Henry Breasted. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1924. Pp. xiv+625+xlix.

"All this book," intended for use in high school, is, as the authors declare in their preface, "*really about the present*, since only those events have been included that explain things as they are." In accordance with their announcement, emphasized by their italics, they have come down to 1814 in a little more than half the volume. The century, 1814-1914, is reviewed in about 165 pages; the decade, 1914-1924, in about 120 pages. We cannot say that we are of the same mind as the authors about this emphasizing of the present at the expense of the past. Though we forbear discussing this vagary of pedagogy, we must say that to it are due most of the faults of the book.

The compression of the past inevitably resulted in statements that are misleading. The German migrations have once more become "invasions" (p. 88). In the feudal age "brute force ruled everywhere outside the Church" (p. 107). Too much is made of the medieval venerations for Aristotle. Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas did much more than prepare "elaborate commentaries on his works" (p. 143). The paragraph on scholasticism is so interesting a bit of confusion and of appreciation that we quote it:

> The name *scholasticism* is commonly given to the beliefs and method of discussion of the medieval professors. To those who later outgrew the fondness for logic and the supreme respect for Aristotle, scholasticism, with its neglect of Greek and Roman literature, came to seem a dry and profitless form of education. The scholastic training in logic, if it did not increase

> the sum of human knowledge, accustomed the student to make careful distinctions and to present his arguments in an orderly way."

The popes "deserted Rome to live on the boundaries of France, at Avignon" (p. 150). Philip IV of France is nowhere noted, and his Estates General is indefinitely referred to as "having been organized about the same time that the English Parliament was growing up" in connection with the Ordinance of 1439 (p. 162). Evidently we are to believe that Europe *"caught up with ancient times"* when the humanists began to study Greek (p. 153). Aldus is prominently mentioned in the early part of the discussion of printing (p. 153), and Mainz is noticed toward the end (p. 155); Gutenberg's name appears only under a facsimile of a page of the first printed bible (opposite p. 155). Did the hard-headed electors of the Holy Roman Empire just get into "the habit" of electing the emperor from the Hapsburg family? (p. 163). Was Luther so mild-mannered about the efficacy of good works as to maintain that "frequent attendance at Mass, the recitation of prayers, pilgrimages, and the veneration of relics" were "unnecessary for salvation and sometimes misleading" (p. 167). The note attached to the word, "misleading," begins with a phrase careful historical writers never use, "about this time." Did Holland and Portugal become great colonizing countries? (p. 178). Lepanto is not mentioned. Henry of Portugal never ruled Portugal (p. 157) and too little is said about this great figure. Richelieu decided to renew the old struggle with the Hapsburgs after Gustavus Adolphus died (p. 186).

Some other statements and attitudes are open to objection. The heading of paragraph 374 (p. 182) might be amended; "Elizabeth establishes the Church of England." Some of the spell of the glories of Elizabeth's reign is gone, for Shakespeare at last wrote some of his plays while James I reigned, but that wasn't James' fault any more than it had formerly been Elizabeth's. Elizabeth was "reluctantly" persuaded to sign Mary Stuart's death warrant (p. 184), but was not the English drama then in its golden age. Spain gets conventional treatment. Spaniards were "gold-seekers, not colonizers."

Apparently it was the proper thing for Englishmen of Eliza-

beth's time to sail about the globe capturing Spanish ships and plundering Spanish colonies, (p. 181), for we do not find any remark about the right or wrong of such conduct. The Dutch are still a plucky little people mightily sinned against (p. 178). There is no mention of English machinations in the Spanish-American revolutions (p. 348). The real value of Silesia and the Oder River valley is not mentioned (p. 218), and, in America, the geographical factor in the dispersion of the French and the consequent essential weakness of their colonies is not noted. Opportunities to connect geography with history should not be passed by.

We cannot help noting, too, that in the final chapter, "Facing the Problems of Our World To-day" Protestant and Catholic reform programs are ignored. The "Hopes of H. G. Wells" are quoted verbatim for fifteen lines. Sifted to the bottom, he said less in these fifteen lines than he succeeded in saying in many another group of similar length in his *Outlines*—"We know enough to-day to know that there is infinite room for betterment in every human concern. Nothing is needed but collective effort." Any boy scout might have added a much more worth while item to the list of the "good" things of which some denizen of the slums of any European city knows little according to Mr. Wells,—a daily bath, beautiful clothes, the climbing of mountains for pleasure, flying, meeting agreeable and well-mannered people, conducting researches, or making delightful things. Greater and more fundamental than any of the four problems that are noted as facing us to-day (p. 606) is that of how to bring men back to the knowledge and practice of charity. What a mistake the Lord made when He came in the beginning of our era and not in the time of Marx, Wells, and Lenin; He might have got a hearing.

The publishers have made the volume a thing of beauty surpassed only, we think, by their production of Lawler's *Gateway to American History* for the grades. Most of the illustrations are new to text-books; they are well selected and admirably done. Portraits are frequently taken from the paintings of famous artists and the artist's name is supplied. Illuminating notes accompany the pictures. An excellent set of maps, each

map preceded by suggestions for study and practical exercise, is inserted at the end of the volume.

FRANCIS J. TSCHAN.

The Naval History of the Great War: Offensive Operations 1914-1915. By Thomas G. Frothingham, Captain U. S. R. Military Historical Society of Massachusetts. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924. Pp. xii+349.

Captain Frothingham wrote this account of the early naval operations of the Great War for the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts from data provided by the Historical Section of the United States Navy, from British naval correspondence and minutes, and from memoirs. To these sources he gives, however, only vague references in the foot-notes, necessitating the turning of many pages of the accessible material for verification and further study. Such notices as "Admiral Tirpitz: My Memoirs," "Lord Salisbury," "Bethmann-Hollweg," "Ludendorff" will not do in a work of this character. The maps that are conveniently distributed through the volume add to the clearness of the text.

The book is a chronicle of the mistakes of both the Germans and the British. Still under the spell of their military success in 1870-1871, the Germans practically ignored the navy in their plans for the 1914 campaign. The General Staff made no effort to seize the Channel ports in the course of its drive on Paris, and to use the navy to obstruct the passage of troops from England to France. These mistakes contributed much to the German failure at the Marne in September, 1914, and turned the war into an endurance contest.In this contest the command of the seas, which the Germans conceded to the Allies, was decisive. The Allies, however, blundered by not promptly seizing the Baltic and the Dardanelles. Through her hold on the Baltic Germany drew on the resources and trade of the neutral Scandinavian countries and prevented the greatest possible coöperation of Russia with her western allies. Through her hold on the Dardanelles, Germany influenced the Turks to join her, and further prevented effective Russian coöperation with her western allies. The British also lived so constantly in dread of a Ger-

man invasion of their island that they withheld troops from France, and allowed German ships in foreign ports, especially Admiral Spee's command in the Far East, to escape to sea and to prey upon commerce. While Admiral Jellicoe, in constant fear of mines and submarines, patrolled the home waters to prevent an invasion of England, Captain Müeller of the *Emden* disarranged British plans in the Indian Ocean; Admiral Spee defeated Admiral Cradock at Coronel off the western coast of South America; and Admiral Souchon brought the *Goeben* and *Breslau* safely out of the western Mediterranean to Constantinople. Despite the final folly of Admiral Spee in his attack on the Falkland Islands, in which his fleet was destroyed (November 1, 1914), the work of these lesser commanders of the German navy contrasts most favorably with the self-confident courses of the bureaucracy that directed the war from Berlin. Not less stupid, however, seem the courses of the British authorities. Only slowly did these men work out a systematic blockade of Germany, and ration the trade of the neutral states, with which Germany enjoyed uninterrupted communication, according to precedents set by the Washington government in our Civil War. The foremost sea-lord of England, Admiral Fisher, even worked on a plan to invade Germany via Pomerania based on Russian assistance that could not possibly be got. Finally, all the advantages of an unexpected attack on the Dardanelles were thrown away by striking with ships only when it was perfectly clear that the navy alone could not hold the proposed objective (if it could be won) without the coöperation of the army. Sadly evident in the operations of the first eight months of the war (so far Captain Frothingham carries the story) are the evils of the exclusive importance which the Germans had attached to their "dry-land" war, and the emphasis which the British had placed upon the material development of their navy. In another volume the author promises to tell us about the subsequent phase of the war in which the Germans developed the submarine as a means of wearing down the sea-power of their foes, and the Entente learned the value of combining military with naval action.

FRANCIS J. TSCHAN.

Frederick Law Olmstead: A Critic of the Old South. By Broadus Mitchell, Ph.D., Associate in Political Economy. Johns Hopkins University. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XLII, No 2. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1924. Pp. 158.

To those who have turned from that very proper emotional tale of the horrors of southern slavery by Harriet Beecher Stowe in search of an account that is, like Olmstead's, more human and reasoned, this monograph must be welcome. Olmstead was a versatile genius, born in New England and irregularly educated, who drew from haphazard farming sound principles of landscape gardening, and from week-end arguments with his friends singular powers of observation and criticism. To Olmstead as a landscape architect New York and Chicago owe the beginnings of their parks, and America, perhaps, the preservation of Niagara Falls. To Olmstead as an observer and critic the literature of travels, economics, and history owes a series of volumes descriptive of the Slave States on the eve of their rebellion. Olmstead's economic books were tempered and reasoned, and, perhaps, for this reason did not in their day get the hearing which they deserved, and are to-day too little known by the reading public. Dr. Mitchell has brought together in this monograph Olmstead's statements of his views on life in the antebellum South as he saw it on his travels, and on the economics of slavery of which he made a careful, first-hand study. Olmstead's conclusions are critically checked against those of others who visited the South in the same period, notably Martineau's and Russell's, or who lived in that section, notably Dew's. A checking of the text and notes against Olmstead has given us such a regard for Dr. Mitchell's workmanship and judgment that we hesitate to say that his statement, —"Reconstruction might have been a different thing had Olmstead continued in his social interests instead of becoming absorbed in the practice of landscape architecture" (p. 65),—is too generous. We hope that Dr. Mitchell will some day check Russell's *Diary* against facts and conditions as they were in his day, and reveal the behavior of his mind and that of the English reading public, for

which he travelled and wrote, toward men and affairs in the first stages of our Civil War.

FRANCIS J. TSCHAN.

The Common Sense of the Constitution. By A. T. Southworth, English High School. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1924. Pp. 159.

The author of this little book is to be highly commended for his attempt "to make available to every American citizen, whether pupil or grown up," a knowledge of the American Constitution. Within the possibilities afforded by the limited space of 114 pages, Professor Southworth, in a clear, simple, paragraph-by-paragraph explanation of the Constitution, has succeeded admirably in the task he has undertaken. For this serviceable explanation of the fundamental law of our country, the average citizen, who has not the time to read one of the larger manuals, will be deeply grateful. Its usefulness would, however, have been considerably enhanced by the addition of an index.

D. A. MCLEAN.

The Life and Reign of Edward the Fourth, King of England and of France and Lord of Ireland. By Cora L. Scofield, Ph.D. In two volumes. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1923. Pp. x + 595; iii + 526.

The first impression made upon the reader of these volumes is that of painstaking industry. It is the industry of a scholar and it has carried Dr. Scofield through the manuscript material in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, the London Archives, Guildhall, and the Bibliothèque Nationale, not to mention a formidable array of printed books, only partly noted in the list inserted at the end of the second volume. The second impression is that of endless detail. Volume one opens with this sentence,—"Edward, second son and third child of Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York, and Cecily Neville, his wife, was born at Rouen, in Normandy, on 28th April, 1442, at forty-four minutes after two o'clock in the morning, and according to a note left by

the antiquarian, John Stow, the christening took place in the cathedral of Rouen." The description of the king's funeral toward the close of volume two occupies two full pages. Evidently Dr. Scofield has withheld from us little or nothing but has poured out the full store of her copious notes. Nor has Dr. Scofield paused for extended comment on men and events. A sentence now and then suffices; she has held herself closely to a plain and accurate presentation of the facts. It should be added that the matter is clearly organized and that the volumes are very readable. The choice of words and phrases is sometimes what would be expected of an English rather than an American writer, and the sentences are sometimes so long that the attention flags.

These volumes are a contribution to the "old" history, not to the "new" history. They record the life history of the king, his struggle for the throne, his marriage and his relations with his wife's kindred, his troubles with his brothers, and his marriage negotiations for his seven daughters. The volumes also constitute a veritable history of diplomacy, and it is an age when this has become an important matter; the dynastic struggle in England is caught in a web of diplomacy which includes Scotland, Burgundy, France, Castile, Aragon, and the Papacy. In such matters as these the student of the reign of Edward IV will seldom or never have to go beyond Dr. Scofield's study. But if the student's interest be the disappearance of serfdom, the rise of the parish as an organ of local government, or even major items in constitutional, economic or ecclesiastical history he will not find much help here. The author has collected some material in these fields and the reader will find it assembled separately in three chapters of "Miscellanea," at the end of the second volume. Here is presented in the author's thoroughgoing fashion the developments in the king's council, the king's relations with his parliaments, his interest in heresy-hunting, in building, and in William Caxton. The index is very full, though it consists almost wholly of proper names.

W. O. AULT,
Boston University.

T. Jefferson Coolidge 1831-1920, An Autobiography, edited by W. C. Ford. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1923. Pp. 311.

Privately printed in 1902 for a narrow circle of intimate friends and relatives, the editorial committee of the Massachusetts Historical Society deserves well for giving the Coolidge Autobiography to a wider circle of readers. It is a rich storehouse of information and impressions concerning education, political events, industry, and men. Coolidge was not a great figure save in a local way, but he lived a full and interesting life. He seems to have represented the social, intellectual, and financial group of Boston at its best. Not intolerant, he viewed men and issues in a broad way, and writing privately he frankly expressed his views.

Descended from the Coolidge of Watertown (1630), on his mother's side he was a grandson of Randolph and a great grandson of Jefferson. Educated in Switzerland and Dresden for ten years, on returning to enter Harvard he spoke English with difficulty and found himself un-American: "My views of my countrymen had been formed in Europe, I considered them barbarous. I believed myself to belong to a superior class, and that the principle that the ignorant and poor should have the same right to make laws and govern as the educated and refined was an absurdity. It took me many years to outgrow my priggism..... My education abroad had taught me French and German and made me unfit to be happy or successful in my own country." (p. 6). Ahead of his class, he grew indolent and learned little in Harvard. Of the class he wrote: "There were many Southerners. These gentlemen spent much money, drank freely, and considered themselves better than the Northern mudsills; they were overbearing and quarrelsome, but brave and full of honour, although they often did not pay their debts. In short, they had the vices and virtues which are generally found with slave owners. That whole class was swept away eleven years afterwards by the Civil War." (p. 7). Regretfully looking back over his school years, he observed: "I devoted fourteen years to the study of Latin and yet never could read Horace for pleasure. In Greek, when I gave it up, I could only stammer

through Homer. How infinitely better employed I should have been in studying natural history or chemistry or geology or English literature." (p. 4).

On graduation, as a political career then lent little distinction, Coolidge turned to business and money-making as the one avenue to success. In this he was aided by marrying into the Appleton-Lawrence families. During the war he hired a substitute for $750, though many of his associates paid $1000, and made the nucleus of his later fortune by buying iron, coffee, and necessities on a rising market. Later business ventures, association with the Lawrence Manufacturing Company, bank connections, directorship in Burlington Railroad, manager and president of the Amoskeag Mills, presidency of the Santa Fè Railway, and founder of the Old Colony Trust, made him a conspicuous industrial leader and wealthy enough to be eligible for our foreign service. The *Autobiography* is little concerned with his business affiliations.

Membership in the Friday Club gave Coolidge intellectual stimulus and the pleasure of intercourse with Justice Curtis, Lowell, Felton the Greek professor, Tichnor, Agassiz, C. F. Adams, Chief Justice Bigelow and others. Dr. Holmes, it appears would allow no man to talk, so he was not included but often appeared as a visitor. Of him Coolidge, whose creed was doubtful, wrote: "He was an agnostic and many a struggle on the Christian religion do I recollect between him and Judge Curtis, when I have seen the tears glisten in Curtis's eyes." (p. 14). Apparently it was in the same circle that, "Sophocles, the Greek professor at Harvard, made the statement that without convents we should have lost not only our present civilization but the Christian religion" (p. 47). Adams discussed the difficulties of his ministry at the Court of St. James, and Ropes the military side of the Civil War before the little coterie. Indeed, it was from such conversations that Coolidge obtained many impressions which appear in his notes.

In April of 1858, he found that: "The city of Boston was full of revivals; every church had prayer meetings where fools and dupes mingled with rascals to proclaim that they had at last found salvation and prayed for everything. Theodore Parker attacked the movement with his usual ability and blasphemy,

and was prayed for by name." (p. 14). This was part of the fanaticism of the wild abolutionist and Know-Nothing days in Boston, with which the "cottonocracy" of the warehouses and wharves had no sympathy.

Coolidge's father-in-law was the only non-Republican sent by Massachusetts to Congress in 1860. He was warned by Governor Aiken of South Carolina that the state would secede. In the meantime while Everett, General Cushing, Chief Justice Shaw and B. R. Curtis were urging moderation and the repeal of unconstitutional legislation, Wendell Philipps poured out vials of wrath: "his eloquent and inflammatory harangues are spread broadcast over the land to exercise their pestilential influence." In November, the money market broke, banks would not discount; later a million dollar government fraud and twelve per cent interest was noted. In 1865 on the death of Everett, Coolidge confided to his diary: "When he was president of Harvard College, I sat under him; but with all his ability he had not the necessary force to gain the admiration of the students, and his political life was a failure, partly owing to the fact that he and R. C. Winthrop took the unpopular side and endeavored to prevent the Civil War by counselling moderation and justice. I had the same views and voted against the Republicans on the Whig side and after the end of the Whigs on the Democratic. But looking back, I am convinced that I was wrong." (p. 49).

Secession, Sumpter, and the Baltimore mob attack on the Sixth Massachusetts cured Boston men of southern sympathies. In May, 1861, Coolidge wrote of the English attitude: "Lord John Russell and the English sympathize with the South and talk of treating their pirates as belligerents..... The English have always been guided by their own interest; they want cotton and they don't like our tariff. Their pretended horror for slavery vanishes as soon as money points the way." (p. 26). C. F. Adams told him that there was a drop of ten to fifteen per cent in consols in the Trent days, though the danger was lessened by British intelligences that Canada could not be defended and Ireland would break in rebellion in case of war with the United States. Tichnor doubted if Ireland would cause much trouble. Adams was annoyed by Lincoln's unofficial observers

whom he regarded as failing entirely in England save possibly Thurlow Weed. (p. 71).

Visiting Washington and the camps, Coolidge was annoyed by the extravagance with which the war was conducted, the political officers afraid of the soldier vote, wastage of munitions and supplies, and the forty-two dollars pay, expenses and family allowance of a private. He rightly censured the draft rioters in New York and the incipient disorders in Boston, but failed to see that the bounty system which allowed men of his standing to escape service was at the bottom of it. Only by rioting could the laborer and immigrant protest forcibly. And protest was needed for huge fortunes were made in contracts and gold speculation by patriots who hired a poor man to fight in their stead.

After the war, Coolidge left for a three years' vacation in Europe. In England he met his uncle, Randolph, who had been a general and Confederate Secretary of War. In Rome, 1866, he noted: "Palm Sunday at St. Peter's impressed me more than anything I had seen. The enthusiasm of 20,000 people kneeling in the immense cathedral whilst voices of the angels and the trumpets of glory from on high answer one another across the aisles, excited your religious sentiment to the highest point." To Rome he returned for Easter Sunday. The Hospice of the Great St. Bernard was visited, as was Lourdes which however impressed him unfavorably. In Spain, he found the American minister quite melancholy and cut off from society as he spoke neither French nor Spanish, but Coolidge was able to enjoy everything from the art galleries and Seville Cathedral to a bullfight.

On his return, America was prosperous, the disorders of 1870-1871 in Europe had increased immigration and improved our securities. Shortly afterward came the panic and railroad receiverships. His railroad interests brought him west, where he became an intimate of the Catholic archbishop of Santa Fè and to Chicago where he met Sheridan, "a handsome, powerfully built but short man decidedly Irish, full of amiability and humor."

In connection with his father's death in 1879, he observed that he did not know his religious views as he had never heard

him express an opinion. Several aged men like Appleton he knew to be agnostics. He himself seems to have turned to public service, as a park commissioner of Boston, donor of a physics building to Harvard, of a library to Manchester-by-the-Sea, as an overseer of Harvard, as a supporter of the public high school to which he sent his daughters despite the regrets of his friends, and as a member of the Pan-American Conference.

An ardent high tariff man, he was a stout supporter of Harrison and spent much time in Washington during the administration. From 1890-1896, he feared free silver and was menaced by dropping securities. In 1892 he was sent as minister to France where he found himself outranked by nine ambassadors and about twenty-five ministers. The insult suffered from the Russian ambassador and his protestations had something to do with our substitution of ambassadors for ministers in case of the greater countries. His views of French politics, Panama scandal, Clemanceau, and the possibility of a coup d'etat are of interest. He attended Renan's funeral with Andrew White, minister to Russia, but found few of the diplomatic corps as the nuncio and representatives from Catholic countries absented themselves. On Christmas he attended midnight Mass at St. Eustace, finding Notre Dame closed. Again, he notes that the city laborers are radical but the peasants, religious. And with the socialistic attack on the Church, he had no sympathy for in visiting a village school of the Sisters of Charity he wrote: "The French Government has driven these worthy teachers out of almost all the schools in France, but this little one appears to have been overlooked." (p. 175). He found interest in the marriage of General McClellan's daughter, a convert, to a French diplomat serving as a witness in both the civil and religious ceremonies. His term was short, for Cleveland's election brought a turn-over in the diplomatic and even the consular corps.

There is good material on business conditions during the Cleveland period, the dangerous extension of the Monroe Doctrine, the rise of cotton manufacturing in the South, the shifting of railroad interests from Boston to New York, the Behring Sea controversy, and the populist and free silver controlled Democratic convention of 1896. Urged by Massachusetts leaders for

the treasury in McKinley's cabinet, Coolidge was not appointed because Long was already slated for the Navy and Gage of Chicago was selected. No imperialist, he believed that McKinley yielded to bossism of the senators and to public clamor when the war with Spain might have been avoided. This seems to be the view of Rhodes in his recent volume. War declared, the nation unprepared, he felt that Senator Alger was unfairly made to shoulder all responsibility. With this administration, Coolidge's active life and his *Autobiography* ended.

Mr. J. T. Morse in a tribute suggests that while Coolidge was highly successful, his business morality was sound even in the post Civil War days when the scrambling for wealth was unprincipled and large fortunes were more frequent than unspotted reputations. His book is not another *Education of Henry Adams,* but it is a valuable sidelight on a long period of American history.

R. J. P.

Selections from the Latin Fathers, with commentary and notes, by Peter E. Hebert, C.S.C. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1924. Pp. xvii+186.

Father Hebert's book of selections is the first serious attempt to meet the growing demand for text-books, which will make possible the introduction of some Christian Latin into the school and college curriculum. The 120 pages of Latin text include selections from Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Saint Cyprian, Lactantius, Saint Ambrose, Saint Jerome, Saint Leo the Great, Saint Bernard, and Saint Augustine. The selection from Saint Bernard does not seem to belong with the rest. Saint Bernard is too far removed chronologically from the other authors represented, and his writings breathe the spirit of a different age.

Some 65 pages of notes of a varied character accompany the Latin text. Probably no two persons will agree as to what should be included in or omitted from the commentary of a college text. To me at any rate the notes exhibit a great unevenness. Much is given, the usefulness of which for college classes is difficult to see; and much too is lacking which I should consider highly desirable for students just making their way into Ecclesiastical Latin. The complete omission of all refer-

ences to syntax, for the reason that the syntactical differences between Ecclesiastical and Classical Latin are too trivial to deserve mention, is a serious pedagogical error. Striking syntactical differences do exist between the two periods of the Latin language, and it is only because scholars have not given them the study they deserve that they sometimes fail to attract attention. I fear that the use of the book will be difficult because of the omission of this information of fundamental importance.

The introduction tells us that the text has been taken from Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. While the Migne collection is very useful and in fact often contains the best text available for a work, yet it certainly is not to be followed where we have the modern scientific texts of the so-called "Vienna Corpus." Nearly all of texts excerpted for this book of selections are represented in the "Vienna Corpus," and these certainly should have been adopted. Where the "Vienna Corpus" lacked a particular work, there only should the author have drawn on the "Migne."

ROY J. DEFERRARI.

The Early History of the Christian Church from Its Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century. By Monsignor Louis Duchesne, Hon. D.Litt. Oxford and Litt.D Cambridge, Membre de l'Institut de France. Vol. III—The Fifth Century. English translation by Claude Jenkins. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1924. Pp. xiv+555.

When Monsignor Duchesne died in April, 1922, the ecclesiastical world mourned the passing of one of the best known ecclesiastical scholars of recent times. An octogenarian, like two other great writers within the fold, Cardinals Gasquet and Ehrle, he wrought into his writings the matured experiences of an intensely busy life and revealed to the jejune historians of our day that scholarship is an acquisition of laborious service.

Born in 1843 at Saint-Servan, in Brittany, Mgr. Duchesne was ordained priest in 1867, and ten years later gained his doctorate by a thesis in Latin and French on the *Liber Pontificalis*. He became a conference master at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, whence he passed to the Institut Catholique of Paris as professor of Christian Archeology and History. As a member of the

French schools at Athens and Rome he was entrusted in the 70's with missions to Mount Athos, Saloniki, Patmos and the south of Asia Minor. In 1888 he was elected a member of the Academy of Inscriptions and Literature; in 1900 came the honor of an appointment as Prothonotary Apostolic and of election to the chair in the French Academy rendered vacant by Cardinal Mathieu. In 1901 he was nominated as Consultor of the Congregation of Indulgences and Relics, in Rome, and in 1913 he was chosen by the French Government as director of the French school there.

Monsignor Duchesne was misunderstood by many owing to his rigid application of scientific methods of research and judgment; some "pious" souls even regarded him as an ecclesiastical vandal. By those who knew him intimately he was recognized as a master of the sciences which are *les instruments de travail of the historian.* DeRossi, the outstanding authority on the Catacombs, said of him: "I write nothing without asking myself what Duchesne thinks of it." Mgr. Battifol, in an address to the students of the University of Strasburg, some weeks previous to the venerable author's death, crowned this by the statement: "You cannot doubt the service which Mgr. Duchesne renders to us." In a discerning article in the *Figaro* discussing Duchesne's services to the Church and France M. Georges Goyau pointed out how it was Duchesne who disposed of a German critic who would rob Paris of her patron, St. Genevieve; who at the Sorbonne established the historical arguments on the antiquity of the Primacy of the Apostolic See; and who in his *Origins of Christian Worship* pointed out the two-fold sacredness of ancient rites which come to us from God by Christ and the Church, and are still hallowed to us by the piety of so many generations of man. M. Goyau then sums up the case: "A Duchesne, the champion of a saint! a Duchesne, establishing in the secular Sorbonne the titles of the Apostolic See to Christian credence; a Duchesne, moved to tenderness over the old missals in which so many souls felt the finger of God, and by which their souls were lifted up to Him: such a one must be a surprise for those who see in him but a destroyer of legends, a Voltaire in a cassock." To Duchesne's loyalty and fervor there is abundant testimony. When in 1877 his first book had aroused criticism in Rome he wrote: "Reared in respect and obedience to the

Church, it needs no effort on my part to do what so dear and venerated authority may require." In his native Saint-Servan, where he had a modest little lodging, he was popularly known as *"le bon aumonier,"* and his own explanation of why during his residence in Rome he said Mass in the adjoining parish church rather than in the Plazzo Farnesse, was that he wished to have around him souls of pious women to pray with him. This is not the spirit of an iconoclast.

Chief among his works, which included many articles in the learned reviews, are the following: *Memoire sur une mission au Mont-Athos; La Répresentation des Mages en Orient et en Occident depuis les premiers siècles* (1877); *Vita S. Polycarpi autore Pionio* (1881); *La Crypte de Mellébaude et les prétendus martyrs de Poitiers* (1885); *Etude sur la liturgie latine avant Charlemagne* (1889); *Les Anciens Catalogues épiscopaux de la ville de Tours* (1890); An edition of the *Liber Pontificalis*, which was his *magnum opus; Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule; Vie de sainte Geneviève* (1893); *Origines du culte chrétien* (1897), which has been translated into English, and the work now under review, whose French title is *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, a work which caused some sensation, for in its Italian translation it was placed on the Index until certain modifications had been made by the author.

Here it should be noted that Mgr. Duchesne's writings often brought him disappointment and sorrow, but he proved himself a loyal and faithful son of the Church. He had many faithful and enthusiastic disciples, and a host of faithful friends. Only a few days before his death he had been received most cordially by the Holy Father whose personal esteem he had long enjoyed. His critics are found chiefly among a class of writers who lack both the scholarship and the perspective requisite for an intelligent appreciation of the erudition, honesty, and critical discrimination of this distinguished Breton scholar.

A note by Mr. Jenkins, the translator of *The Early History of the Christian Church* tells us that he has made an effort "to reproduce Mgr. Duchesne's words as faithfully as possible, even at the sacrifice of smoothness of expression." The translation needs no apology, and comparison with the original reveals that there is little to be desired, and Mr. Jenkins has been unusually successful in his rendition of the expressive language of the au-

thor. Of course, it is impossible for any translator to "translate" the various *tournures* and *nuances* which are characteristic of a literary Breton. Nevertheless, the work is admirable in every sense. English readers possess a very valuable adjunct in the splendid Index of some eighty pages which Mr. Jenkins "has ventured to add"—a venture which students and investigators will appreciate beyond expression.

The volume deals with "the melancholy fifth century," which witnessed the collapse of the Roman Empire in the West, which says the author might have been long delayed if not obviated if the Church had been able to lend its aid, "but the Church too is in convulsion." There were serious difficulties as Alexandria was in conflict with Constantinople, the East with the West. "Christian unity is sacrificed to the unprofitable defense of personal feeling." We are warned, however, not to "exaggerate the details." Again, "we must be carefully on our guard against supposing that the causes of this turmoil in theology was a serious doubt as to the tradition. That had long been fixed."

Though "melancholy" there are many picturesque and even attractive figures in the fifth century, such as Epiphanius, St. Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria, and the great Augustine, "who stands upon an eminence entirely by himself"; and "from his far-off African home his influence extended over the whole of Christendom." He was the teacher of the whole of the Middle Ages." "From some points of view he belongs to all ages. His soul passed into his writings; in them, it still lives."

Though "melancholy" the fifth century was the century of the Fathers of the Church, and the author tells us: "History here has an enormous library at its command. Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Theodoret have left us an imposing mass of completed works.....which are storehouses of information." Documents for the period are numerous; but, says the author: "the same can by no means be said of historical narratives. We have no longer Eusebius, nor even Socrates."

There are fifteen lengthy chapters covering nearly six hundred pages: I, The Church in the Days of Theodosius I and II; II, Origenism and St. Jerome; III, Chrysostom and Theophilus; IV, The End of Donatism; V, Alaric; VI, Pelagius; VII, Pope Zosimus; VIII, Augustinianism; IX, Atticus and Cyril; X, The

Tragedy of Nestorius; XI, The Council of Chalcedon; XII, The Monophysites; XIII, Christianity East of the Empire; XIV, The West in the Fifth Century; XV, The Roman Church in the Fifth Century.

Within these chapters we find discussion of every larger factor which affected the growth and position of the Church. The facts are set before us with a wealth of erudition and presented with a vividness and originality peculiar to Mgr. Duchesne. The narrative is continuous and graphic and has an *attrait* that few works of history possess. Withal a searching analytic process is observed and nought set down without evident discrimination. Documentary evidence buttresses the facts, and one feels that he is safe under such guidance. There is no false system of apologetics, and human weaknesses are not glossed over through motives of false respect for "the wickedness in high places."

Readers of this volume will naturally be interested in the topic which has an appeal to them either from an academic viewpoint or otherwise; and, possibly no two will evaluate the chapters according to the same scale. To the reviewer the chapters "Alaric" and "Augustinianism" are of supreme importance to the student of the ecclesiastical and the civil history of the fifth and the preceding centuries. The initial paragraph of the chapter, "Alaric," States:

> The Roman Empire did not die in a moment. From the time of the terrible crisis witnessed by the contemporaries of the Emperor Decius down to the day when Mahomet II entered as conqueror into St. Sophia, there stretches step by step a long series of partial catastrophes. One of the darkest hours in this mournful story is the beginning of the fifth century. It was then that the Latin frontier was broken on all sides, that the Western Empire was reduced to nothing, that the sanctuary of Rome was violated, and that the bewildered Christians mourned over the Babylon of the Seven Hills as Jeremiah had wept over Jerusalem: *Facta est quasi vidua domina gentium! Princeps provinciarum facta est sub tributo!*
>
> And it was a pitiful fall. A few legions, commanded, I do not say by Scipio or by Caesar but by a leader of moderate calibre, would have disposed without difficulty of the disordered bands before whom trembled the subjects of Honorius. But within the borders of the ancient empire there was now to be

found nothing but weakness. We look in vain for a focus of national energy, a centre of action and of military control. A few mandarins in solemn gradation around a seraglio, a collection of lay-figures busied in paltry intrigues or running after sordid gains—such was the character of the Court of Ravena. (p. 104).

In view of certain military exploits of recent days the following is quite apposite: Fortunately Alaric and his Goths were Christians: orders were given to kill as little as possible, and to allow full access to the hallowed asylum of the two sanctuaries of the Apostles. Both were outside the walls and had long been in power of the besiegers. On their approach the precious vessels of the Basilica of St. Peter had been hidden in the city. A Gothic soldier found them in the house of an old woman; and Alaric, on being informed of this, caused them to be carried back under an adequate escort to the tomb of the Apostle, whither they were followed by a number of Romans. (p. 109).

There was grief on all sides over the fall of the ancient city; and Pagan bewailings found expression in fierce denunciation of the new religion and the Christians' God. "Behold," said the pagans, "behold the vengeance of the gods! Rome where they had so often saved their deserted altars. In the hour of peril their succor had failed it."

Even Christians were disturbed. It seemed to them that the true God recognized by Rome should protect it. They asked, What had it gained by becoming Christian? What aid had been given to its defense by the Apostles and martyrs whose tombs surrounded its walls?

St. Augustine was greatly concerned at all these complaints and in his sermons he attempted a reply; but the occasion was felt beyond the circle of his hearers:

He resolved to supply an antidote by a book dealing with the subject. This was the famous *City of God.* He worked at it for more than twelve years, publishing it in successive instalments. And even that did not content him. It seemed to him that the whole of history must be summoned to show that catastrophes like that of Rome had been much more frequent and more serious before Christianity than since it appeared. For this purpose he had recourse to the learning of others. A Spanish pupil, Orosius, whom circumstances had brought to him, was entrusted with the development of this thesis. He accomplished it in seven books of his *History Against the Pagans,* the contents of which exactly correspond to the title. The position adopted by Augustine and Orosius compelled them to minimize as much as possible the disaster of 410. Hence they speak of it with an optimism on which too much reliance must not be placed. (p. 137).

The character and policies of the occupants of the Chair of

Peter are delineated with a master hand, and we pay tribute where tribute is due, and honor where honor rested. Notable among the pontiffs was the great St. Leo. Says the author: "Among the Popes who, in the last century of the Western Empire, presided over the Roman Church and the Universal Church none has left a deeper mark than Leo.....For a period of one-and-twenty-years he was master of circumstances of the greatest gravity. Leo saw Italy a prey to the terrors of Attila, Rome insulted by Genseric. With these two scourges of God he had to go to hold parley, to endeavor to impose upon them some respect for the majesty of the dying Empire. Under his eyes the House of Theodosius collapsed in frightful catastrophes. And in the midst of these convulsions of the State it was necessary for him to keep his mind stretched towards the East where the Faith was incessantly in peril, to struggle there against ecclesiastical potentates, the violence of monks, the faction at Jerusalem and Alexandria, against the platitudes of Councils, sometimes against the sovereign himself. His admirable letters, not to speak of external documents, bear testimony to his activity and his wisdom. ....Leo speaks as he writes, as he never ceased to think, to feel, and to act like a Roman. Hearing him, seeing him at work, the Senators of Valentinian III must have often thought of their colleagues of the old Republic, those invincible souls whom no trial could cause to quail.

There are few publications of such value as this admirable work of Monsignor, and students of ecclesiastical history must bless his memory and render a frequent *Deo gratias* for such a valuable contribution to a phase of history which never before had such a luminous and erudite exponent.

P. W. B.

Les Hopitaux et la Charite a Paris au XIII^e^ Siecle. By Dorothy Louise Mackay. Paris: Honoré Champion. Pp. 168.

Presumably this book is the thesis which Dr. Mackay presented for the Doctorate of the University of Paris, and most of her work on it was done in the French capital. She states in the preface that it is essentially an elaboration of work done under the direction of Professor Paetow in the University of California for a Master's degree.

Miss Mackay is to be congratulated on her command of the French language and rarely is there any indication of the *mentalité anglaise* which English-speaking students usually betray

when writing in French. She evidently investigated with great thoroughness the authorities which throw light on her subject. She confesses frankly that her work is not a deep study of any particular institution "elle n'est pas l'étude approfondie d'un etablissement particulieur." Few data are available for the smaller hospitals, and Boullé, Brièle, Coyecque, LeGrand, Lallemand have written splendid monographs on the larger institutions. Miss Mackay brings together many facts which are not easily accessible to English students; for this the work is valuable. It is well documented, fifty-nine pages being devoted to *pièces justificatives*, bibliography, and documents. There seems to be confusion, however, in the method of citation and notation and the use of symbols (e. g. pp. 11 and 19). This notwithstanding, the work evinces great industry and painstaking effort on the part of the author. Of course, the French method of bookmaking accounts in a large measure for the *modus compilandi*.

The work, if available in an English dress to a certain class of American readers, would indeed be a "revelation." The modern theorists who hug the delusion that "our hospitals" are purely a creation of the present day would receive quite a shock. Miss Mackay says (and her statements are enforced by unassailable evidence): "Il faut s'arracher au préjudgé invétéré que l'êpoque moderne est la seule où l'on se préoccupe d'hygiène, de propreté et d'organisation." She says further (p. 103) "Il importe d'observer qu'll existe des similitudes frappantes entre les institutions de jadis et celles du monde moderne." Hospitals under the direction of a commission are still in existence, and the Board of Governors is by no means a modern institution. Furthermore—and this is very remarkable—the system of education of the nursing sisterhoods and infirmarians is centuries old. The author says, (p. 104) "Mais encore plus remarquable est la similitude dans la préparation des infirmières, système d'education que nous sommes habitués à considérer comme tout à fait nouveau." She asks pertinently.. "Combien de personnes se rendent compte que les soins aux malades constituaient au treizième siècle une veritable science." Which means, briefly, that the nursing profession comes to us as a heritage from the great thirteenth century.

P. W. B.

The Years of My Pilgrimage, Random Reminiscences. By Rt. Hon. Sir John Ross Bart. Longmans, Green & Co. London: 1924. Pp. 304.

This is not a notable autobiography. Avowedly, it is not an attempt to write history, nor will it merit the historian's attention as a source. It is, however, a fascinating and instructive memoir of an Irishman of Scottish Presbyterian ancestry who as a non-conformist in Trinity College, a thriving barrister, a Unionist member of Parliament from Antrim and Derry, a Lord Justice, and as the last Lord Chancellor of Ireland lived an eventful life full of labors and rich associations. Born in Londonderry (1853), he early was impressed with the significance of "Derry Walls" 1688-1689, and always accepted the politico-religious creed which the symbols connoted. Time lessened his hatred of the Pope, and though a loyalist, Sir John writes almost dispassionately—an Ulsterite with a judicial poise—of Catholics, Nationalists, and Irishmen in general. At one with Salisbury, Balfour, the Cecils, Craig, and Carson, he has kindly words for Isaac Butt, Tim Healy, Parnell, T. P. O'Connor, Florence Driscoll, Thomas Sexton, Redmond, and even for those strangely new men Keir Hardie, and John Burns.

There is a wealth of material on Trinity College and with it a sketch of Dr. Mahaffy the famed Greek scholar and historian: "He was celebrated as an all-around man. There was nothing he could not do—classics, philosophy, papyrus script reading, architecture, music—while his numerous books on Greek life and thought are in every cultured home. He could play cricket with the best. He was an excellent rifle-shot, and as a game-shot in the covert, or in a snipe-bog few could equal him. An accurate scholar he was not, but I have no patience with those who dwell upon his little foibles. His knowledge was simply encyclopaedic, and the trouble he took to amuse the company in a country house, showed the kindliness of his nature. The disappointment of his life was, that the great prize of the Provostship came to him so late." (P. 22).

Naturally, the Chancellor writes at length of the bench and bar, of famous judges and barristers, and of trials with which he was concerned as a barrister or judge. And here, some of the lovable traits of the Irish are depicted, the whole-hearted for-

giveness with which later in life they met the prosecutor or the judge who in line of duty had sentenced them for rioting or cattle driving. Humorous were some of the situations, and nothing is lost in the telling. As a judge of the Land Court, Sir John was immediately concerned with the administration of the Land Acts, which he describes in a valuable chapter.

Of politics from a strictly Ulsterite viewpoint, one learns considerable, and it is well to realize that there were two sides to even the Irish situation and to appreciate the attitude of northern Unionists and of the majority in the Six County region. Sir John Ross understood Ulster and was regarded as its spokesman once he had contested successfully the Derry seat with Justin McCarthy. His chapter on the Great War is intense, and his sketch of the Easter Revolt is most moderate. The Countess Markievitz, he knew well as a friend and kinswoman of Chief Secretary Wyndham. With his friend Augustine Birrell and the execution of the Sinn Fein leaders he had no sympathy, nor had any one save the most savage Orangemen. It was this which turned the tide of sympathy in favor of the rebels. Sadly, he writes: "Three of those executed were poets of great merit, whose works I had read with much pleasure, and I could not but feel regret for their untimely fate." (P. 269). Later he served as chairman of the board hearing appeals in the Irish internment camps, tempering his justice with the memory that his property in the Four Courts had been respected by the revolutionists.

In 1917, Cardinal Logue "a most amiable and kindly man," against whom Judge Ross had served as counsel for a parish priest who had maintained that his office was a freehold, came to Dunmoyle to consecrate a church on the demesne land of his father-in-law who had donated the site. It was a great time in the Ulster village: "When the Cardinal came for the consecration we had the honour of entertaining him, and all the priests in attendance, to luncheon at Dunmoyle. It had a most calming effect on the neighborhood. When the upholders of the warring creeds discovered that the Cardinal, and I who had carried the crimson flag of Derry, could be friends, they proclaimed a peace which continues unbroken to the present day." (P. 273). And in time all Ireland will be taught by such examples!

As senior Lord Justice, the author played an important part in the ceremonies installing Lord Edmund Talbot, Viscount Fitz-Alan, brother of the late Duke of Norfolk, as Viceroy. But the time for welcoming even the first Catholic Viceroy in Ireland was over, for no upholder of the crown could be popular. Ross was made Lord Chancellor the last successor of Stephen de Riddell of the time of Henry II, but his office was shortly terminated by the Free State Constitution. It is with satisfaction that he quotes the generous editorial of the *Freeman's Journal*, as he closed his Irish career and with which he ends his enjoyable book of reminiscences.

R. J. P.

The Rise of Universities, By Charles Homer Haskins, Gurney Professor of History and Political Science, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1923. Pp. ix + 134.

This work, small in form but large in content embodies a series of lectures delivered at Brown University by Dean Haskins under the "Colver lectureship" foundation and stipulates "that so far as possible for these lectures only subjects of particular importance and lecturers eminent in scholarship or of other marked qualifications shall be chosen. It is desired that the lectures shall be distinctive and valuable contributions to human knowledge, known for their quality rather than their number."

The topic discussed is indeed a distinctive and valuable contribution to human knowledge by one whose scholarship is of the highest order. The "qualifications" of Dean Haskins to discuss medieval problems are "marked" beyond compare in the academic life of the country. Those of us who have had the privilege of working under him can perhaps better appreciate these qualifications than even a critical reader.

Dean Haskins has the faculty of making the past truly human and of vitalizing the daily routine of both teacher and student at the medical universities. In an introductory page he says (and we should like to see this emphasized at the present time): "The contrast between the medieval universities and those of to-day is of course broad and striking. Throughout the period of its origins the medieval university had no libraries,

laboratories, no museums, no endowment or buildings of its own; it could not possibly have met the requirements of the Carnegie Foundation! As an historical text-book from one of the youngest of American universities tells us, with an unconscious touch of local color, it had "none of the attributes of the material existence which with us are so self-evident." The medieval university was in the fine old phrase of Pasquier "built of men"—*bâtie en hommes*. Such a university had no board of trustees and published no catalogue; it had no student societies—except so far as the university itself was fundamentally a society of students—no college journalism, no dramatics, no athletics, none of these "outside activities" which are the chief excuse for inside inactivity in the American college.

And yet, great as these differences are, the fact remains that the university of the twentieth century is the lineal descendant of medieval Paris and Bologna. They are the rock whence we were digged. The fundamental organization is the same, the historic continuity is unbroken. They created the university tradition of the modern world, that common tradition which belongs to all our institutions of higher learning, the newest as well as the oldest, and which all university men should know and cherish. (pp. 4-5).

The first lecture deals with the organization of the medieval university as exemplified in the institutions of Bologna and the South, Paris and the North and its conclusion is:

Universities are at times criticised for their aloofness or their devotion to vocationalism, for being too easy or too severe, and drastic efforts have been made to reform them by abolishing entrance requirements or eliminating all that does not lead directly to bread and butter; but no substitute has been found for the university in its main business, the training of scholars and the maintenance of the tradition of learning and investigation. The glory of the medieval university, says Rashdall, was the consecration of learning, and the glory and the vision have not yet perished from the earth.

The medieval professor, studies and text-books, academic status and freedom are discussed in the second lecture, and it is difficult to pick or choose excerpts from the many illuminating and racily recorded items which it contains.

The status of the medieval professor was of course very different from that of the occupant of a professional chair in a modern university.....A professor might not be absent without leave, even a single day, and if he desired to leave town he had to make a deposit to ensure his return. If he failed to secure an audience of five for a regular lecture he was fined as if absent—a poor lecture indeed which could not secure five hearers. He must begin with the bell and quit within one minute of the next bell. He was not allowed to skip a chapter in his commentary, or postpone a difficulty to the end of the hour, and he was obliged to cover ground systematically, so much in each specific term of the year. No one might spend the whole year on introduction and bibliography!

The Middle Ages were a "bookish age," with great reverence for standard authorities, and instruction followed closely the written word.

In the monastic and cathedral schools of the earlier period the text-books were few and simple, chiefly the Latin grammars of Donatus and Priscian with some elementary reading-books, the logical manuals of Boethius, as well as his arithmetic and music, a manual of rhetoric, the most elementary propositions of geometry, and an outline of practical astronomy such as that of the venerable Bede. (p. 39).

To those who regard the Middle Ages and its "disputatious" scholars, we commend the following as of supreme importance:

...For those accustomed to the wide diversities of the modern world, it is easy to form a false impression of the uniformity and sameness of medieval thought. Scholasticism was not one thing but many, as its historians constantly remind us, and the contests between different schools and shades of opinion were as keen as among the Greeks or in our own days. And if the differences often seem minute or unreal to our distant eye, we can make them modern enough by turning for example to the old question of universal conceptions, which divided the Nationalists and Realists of the Middle Ages. Are universals mere names, or have they a real existence, independent of their individual embodiments? A bit arid it all sounds if we make it merely a matter of logic, but exciting enough as soon as it becomes a question of life. The essence of the Reformation lies implicitly in whether we take a nominalist or a realist view of the Church; the central problem of politics depends largely upon a nominalist or a view of the State.....In his own time and in his own way the medie-

val professor often dealt with permanent human interests as he sharpened men's wits and kept alive the continuous tradition of learning. (pp. 78-79).

The concluding lecture describes the medieval students and student affairs. A large section of this graphic description is devoted to students' letters to parents and guardians, and these letters *mutatis mutandis* are not unlike some of the epistolarly performances of the university student of the present day. Most of them have a pecuniary flavor. As an illustration we quote one written "in uncommonly bad Latin":

B. to his venerable Master A., greeting. This is to inform you that I am studying at Oxford with the greatest diligence, but the matter of money stands greatly in the way of my promotion, as it is now two months since I spent the last of what you sent me. I have to rent lodgings, buy necessaries, and provide for many things which I cannot specify. Wherefore I respectfully beg your paternity that by the promptings of divine pity you may assist me, so that I may be able to complete what I have well begun. For you must know that without Ceres and Bacchus Apollo grows cold. (p. 105).

The concluding paragraph of this section summarizes the content of the valuable volume:

In his relations to life and learning the medieval student resembled his modern successor far more than is often supposed. If his environment was different, his problems were much the same; if his morals were perhaps worse, his ambition was as active, his rivalries as intense, his desire for learning quite as keen. And for him as for us, intellectual achievement meant membership in that city of letters not made with hands "the ancient and universal company of scholars."

A Bibliographical Note, which actually is a critical discussion of the materials used in the preparation of the volume is appended; and a valuable Index crowns the most informing and valuable book which the reviewer has read in recent years. It is an indispensable adjunct to the history section of a college or a university library; and evidence of its value and usefulness lies in the fact that it has had more borrowers than any book within the possession of the reviewer. P. W. B.

The Origins of the War of 1870: New Documents from the German Archives. By Robert Howard Lord, Professor of History in Harvard University. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924. Pp. xv + 305.

Dawson, who has given us perhaps the most useful study on Germany of recent years, *The German Empire* 1867-1914, relates that in an interview with Bismarck ere the Emperor William had "dropped the pilot" says: "At the close of a long conversation in which he [Bismarck] had discussed not a few episodes of his political career. 'And history,' I rejoined, 'will tell the truth.' Still I see the grave face which was turned to me as he repeated the words—'Yes, history will tell the truth.'"

Yes, history is now telling the truth and the telling is being done by such men as Professor Lord who within a few years has given the student of history such splendid works as *The Second Partition of Poland, Some Problems of the Peace Conference* (in collaboration with Professor Haskins), and the volume under review.

As far as the reviewer is aware we had previously nothing but *ex parte* discussions of the War of 1870 which was one of the most bitterly contested, the most dramatically decisive, and the most fateful in its consequences for the peace of the world. To the victorious nation it still represents the most glorious page in their history; while in the minds of the vanquished it has rankled as no other disaster that has ever befallen them. Thus it were almost beyond human nature of the intensively nationalized order to approach the subject without the assertive chauvinism of the one party and the panegyrist tendencies of the other whose historical productions have been invariably tinged with apotheosis. One looks in vain in the pages of the apologist for healthy, independent criticism, or even for a straightforward, unvarnished statement of facts.

Knowledge of the causes of the great struggle of 1870 has been rendered difficult for the student of history chiefly because the Imperial German Government refused to allow the publication of diplomatic documents; the Berlin archives were sealed until the revolution of 1918. The French had for a long period published copiously diplomatic documents and thus were able to lay bare many of the facts and incidents preceding the war. Thus

it happens that numerous writers with an excessively developed imaginative faculty found free scope for all manner of conjectures and hypotheses, with the inevitable result that the "historic sense" was nowhere in evidence.

Owing to a change of policy on the part of the German Government Professor Lord has had the privilege of using and transcribing the seven volumes of documents in the Archives of the German Foreign Office which contain the German official record of the diplomatic crisis leading up to the outbreak of the War of 1870. Save for rare exceptions, these documents have never hitherto been printed. They are immensely important and the contribution which Professor Lord makes to modern history cannot fully be appreciated except by those who have been forced to gather piecemeal the data leading up to this disastrous clash. We can now follow in detail the various episodes antecedent to the outbreak of hostilities.

Discussing the responsibilities of France Professor Lord says:

> The charges so generally current immediately after the downfall of the Second Empire that Napoleon and his ministers had deliberately sought for war are no longer seriously made even in Germany (save for rare exceptions). It is now commonly held that the Emperor, although vacillating and inclined at times to defer too much to the clamors of the war party, would, on the whole, very much preferred to keep the peace.....
>
> Much more difficult, and still beset with controversy, is the question of the responsibilities of Germany. Here, after a brief period when Napoleon was made the scapegoat for everything, French historians began an offensive which has ever since been vigorously conducted and which received its strongest expression in Ollivier's dictum: "The real author of the war, he who willed it, sought it, premeditated it, prepared it, rendered it inevitable at the appointed moment was Bismarck (*L'Empire liberal* xiv, p. 542).
>
> Such attacks were for a long time greeted east of the Rhine only with contemptuous angry denials, based on a deeply rooted conviction of Germany's complete innocence of any responsibility. In the eyes of the German public the *Kriegsschuldfrage* for 1870 was as definitely settled against France as in the mind of the French public to-day the similar question about 1914 is settled against Germany. (p. 4).

There is an illuminating discussion of Bismarck's attitude; and, like other worthies with whom diplomacy is a legitimate occasion for the violation of every moral canon and an excuse for using truth with penurious frugality, the "Man of Blood and Iron" is exhibited in a very unfavorable light. Documentary evidence is produced proving that the erstwhile dictator of German policy had been guilty of rather questionable conduct. Especially illuminating is Professor Lord's account of Bismarck's *volte-face* regarding the Hohenzollern Candidacy after he had fallen into disgrace with the Kaiser. Many recall the once famous cartoon in the *Review of Reviews* (and elsewhere) "Dropping the Pilot." "Then the fallen Chancellor....by conversations, by communications to the press, and finally by his memoirs, revealed to a somewhat shocked nation how by his crafty rëediting of the 'Ems Telegram' and the well-calculated publicity he had given it, he had tried, at the supreme moment of the diplomatic crisis, to goad the French into the war." (p. 5).

Following the chapter on "The Question of Responsibilities," there are others bearing the captions, "The Hohenzollern Candidacy," "The Crisis, First Phase, July 3-8, 1870," "The Crisis, Second Phase, July 9-12," "The Renunciation, July 12," "The Ems Incidents and the 'Ems Telegram,' July 13," and "The Final Decisions." These may be termed the *mise-en-scène* of the tragedy. Perhaps the most valuable chapter is that which discusses the Ems incidents and the famous Ems Telegram, for Ems was the pivotal point around which circulated the devious policy of the Iron Chancellor in the greatest crisis of his career. The "perverted telegram" as it has been euphoniously termed by a recent historian was the cause of sending a quarter of a million Germans and Frenchmen to their death. As to the motive we have Bismarck's own admission enshrined in his *Gedanken und Errinnerungen* In his later days he gloated time after time over this motive, and often told with glee how this witches' cauldron of mischief was brewed.

Bismarck's motive was war with France. Professor Lord says: "He also had no doubts and no scruples as to the probable outcome [of the Telegram]—war." Continues the author:

As one means to that end, he exerted himself still further to inflame public opinion.... Bismarck, in the meantime, was busily preparing for a rupture [with France] regarded as in any case inevitable. If France held back, if the Ems Telegraph failed to stir the Gallic bull, he meant undoubtedly to revert to the plan of campaign outlined at the beginning of the supper party on July 13. This plan was devised by Bismarck and two celebrated guests, von Moltke and von Roon. It was sent off over Bismarck's signature to the King [of Prussia]. It ran:

In view of the growing exasperation of public opinion over the presumptuous conduct of France, symptoms of which are coming in to me from the most diverse parts of Germany, I hold it necessary that we should address to France a summons to explain her intention towards Germany. The text of such a document can be fixed only with the cöoperation of Your Majesty's official and natural advisers. Therefore, with Generals von Moltke and von Roon, I venture to renew my respectful request that Your Majesty will deign to return to Berlin. (p. 99).

Bismarck's efforts to whip the dubious South German States into line were a system of compulsion and Bavaria was threatened that "any delay or doubts shown with regard to recognizing the *casus foederis* would be treated by Prussia as a rupture of the alliance (p. 116). These threats were effective. Goaded by the machinations of Bismarck, France presented a declaration of war at Berlin on July 19th.

The statements made in Professor Lord's lengthy Introduction serve as an interpretation of the documents which constitute the major part of the volume. The Documents from the German Archives number two hundred and thirty-five, the remainder, twenty-eight in all, found in the four Appendices cover despatches from Berlin to Spain and Austria, correspondence between Werthen and Bismarck, letters exchanged between Marshall Prim and the Princes of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, and two important memoranda of King William. There is a comprehensive bibliography covering every phase of the subjects discussed in the Introduction. An exceptionally well arranged Index completes the volume. Like the other studies produced by Professor Lord, *The Origins of the War of 1870* is characterized by ripe scholarship, marvellous industry and it clothes the dry bones of documents with a garb of interest that is decidedly alluring.

P. W. B.

NOTICES

(Selected Volumes from this list will be reviewed in subsequent issues.)

The Pope, by Jean Carrère, has just been published by Hutchinson & Co., London. The author has for many years been the Roman correspondent of *Le Temps*. His work consists of a study of St. Peter and of the Papacy. Some notion of his conception of the Papacy's place in history may be gathered from the author's concluding words: "Under whatever new form, whatever unexpected mask, Barbarossa may reappear, we know that sooner or later the successors of Alexander and Peter will make him bow before their moral majesty, and will ultimately destroy him."

History Curricula, by the Sisters of St. Agnes, (Macmillan and Co., New York) is a useful manual for teachers in grade schools in their work. Dr. P. J. McCormick, Dean of Catholic Sisters' College, at the Catholic University, contributes an Introduction, which constitutes a brief dissertation on the principle of correlation in teaching. That principle has been constantly kept in mind by the authors of the manual, and as a result, the teacher may, with comparative ease, not only inculcate lessons in history, but also, lessons in civics, literature, art, politics and general social subjects. In addition to outlines of courses of study in the grades, there is a chapter on methods of teaching history. An excellent feature of the book is its copious and well-selected bibliographies.

Studies in the History of Mediæval Science, by Charles Homer Haskins, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D., Gurney Professor of History and Political Science in Harvard University, is a valuable contribution to the history of the scientific renaissance of the 12th and 13th centuries and the influence of eastern civilization upon the West.

The volume is based upon research in manuscript collections in all parts of Europe and brings to light much material not previously known. For this reason and because of Professor Haskins's high rank as a mediævalist, every one interested in the history of ideas will immediately recognize the importance of this his latest contribution to scholarship.

How To Read History, by W. Watkin Davies, M.A. (New York: George H. Doran Co.)

The title of this book, by an English professor, is misleading. The work is rather a guide to what to read than a treatment of the way to study history. The volume is valuable rather for its omissions than its content. Mr. Davies seems to have little knowledge of the literature of early Christian History. The mendacious Froude is lauded, while such authorities as Pastor, Le Camus, and Duschesne are passed over. It is a pity that "Davies' Modern Readers' Bookshelf" should be marred by such a volume.

Torquemada and the Spanish Inquisition, by Rafael Sabatini. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.)

Mr. Rafael Sabatini is the author of a number of popular novels characterised by vividness of imagination and power of description. Evidently Mr. Sabatini's *metier* is not that of an historian. Picturesqueness is a most desirable quality in historical writing, but *documentary data* are an essential requisite. Few historians worthy of the name now accept the lucubrations of discarded Llorante as an historic record of the Spanish Inquisition.

Religious Outlines for Colleges, by John M. Cooper, D.D. (Catholic Education Press, Washington, D. C.) is the first in a series of four courses on religion for college students. It offers many suggestions for lifting the religion class out of theory and old time routine, and for making it a living, concrete college course. The suggestive questions incorporated at the end of each chapter are excellent. Dr. Cooper's latest work is a worthy successor to his earlier publications.

Longmans, Green & Co. have recently issued the completion of the fourth volume of the New Testament in the *Westminster Version of the Holy Scriptures*. It contains the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Pastoral and Johannine Epistles, and the Catholic Epistles. It is not a translation of the official vulgate, but a new translation from the original Greek texts. It has been highly praised in the Press and in the opinion of many this is the best modern translation of the Scriptures. Certainly the finest brains have been employed in its production. The names of Dr. Gigot, Fr. Lattey, S.J., Dr. Baylon (of Maynooth and University College Dublin), Fr. W. H. Kent, O.S.C., Dr. Dean (of Upholland), and Fr. Rickaby, S.J., represent the exponents of Catholic Bibical scholarship in English-speaking countries to-day.

Le Droit Des Religieuses by P. Louis Fanfani, O.P., (Marietti, Turin) explains to religious congregations of women the laws of the Church which govern their state of life. The book contains an intelligent and useful index, and gives concisely adequate treatment to the various departments and interests of the religious life. It is no mere catalogue of Canons. Rather it is an untechnical commentary and explanation of what is required by the Canons, and by the more recent decisions of the Roman Congregations. This French translation is by the Rev. Louis Misserey, who has also added notes touching the special situation of Religious with solemn vows, living in France since the Revolution.

Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., London, announce the publication of Mr. Herbert Wilson's learned and comprehensive work, *l' Histoire de la Literature Latine Chrétienne*, which had the honour of be-

ing crowned by the French Academy. The English version forms one of the volumes in Messrs. Kegan Paul's History of Civilization Series, and, with a foreword by His Eminence, Cardinal Gasquet, appears under the title, *History and Literature of Christianity From Tertullian to Boethius.*

A new work which will prove indispensable to all Catholic organizers is *The International Handbook of Catholic Organizations*, edited by Rev. Giuseppi Monti, Director of the International Office of Catholic Organizations, Rome. It is published by the "Editions Spes" Society, of 17, Rue *Soufflot, Paris, 5e.*

Contemporary Godlessness, Its Origins and Its Remedy by Fr. John Zybura, of the diocese of Cleveland (Herder, St. Louis). The value of this valuable little book lies in the clear, trenchant and eminently practical development of the argument. Its wealth of illustration, largely from non-Catholic writings, adds greatly to its appeal. There is an impressive record of Ernest Haeckel's downward course from orthodox Lutheran belief to Atheism, drawn from his own letters.

Recollections of a Happy Life, by Maurice Francis Egan. (New York: George H. Doran Co.) is a charming volume. In a sympathetic introduction Dr. Henry van Dyke has written: "I am glad he calls his last book '*Recollections of a Happy Life.*' It is a true title." Dr. Egan dedicates the book "To All My Friends," and the more intimate in that long roll of affectionate friendships, international in its scope, will agree with Dr. van Dyke's characterization of this volume, and recall many incidents that fortified their intimacy with the author.

The period, 1852-1923, was one of the most important in the annals of Catholic America. It saw the growth of the Church from 34 dioceses and a population of 2,100,000 to the present totals of 107 bishoprics and a Catholic body of more than 20,000,000; the great expansion of our educational and philanthropic institutions; and the steady advance in importance and influenec of the Catholic element in the community in the national life. During the period Maurice Francis Egan, as editor, publicist, teacher and diplomat took an active part in its development.

The Gospels—Fact, Myth, or Legend, by J. P. Arendzen, D.D.. Foreword by Cardinal Gasquet. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co.)

In this series of essays the author has given us one of the most readable and at the same time best informed books on the Sacred Scriptures. He is both a master of style and a master in Israel. It is a triumphant vindication of the Gospels against "higher critics." The work is based upon the findings of modern research, to which the writer gives color and life while strictly adhering to the most scientific methods.

The Gateway to American History, by Thomas Bonaventure Lawler (Ginn and Company, Boston and New York) is an engaging approach to the study of the Old World.

Dr. Lawler performs a great service in making children aware how closely the discoveries, inventions, and artistic activities of the ages are bound up with life today. He says in his Preface:

"To us have come down the religion of the Hebrews, the alphabet of the Phoenicians, the coinage of the Lydians, the calendar of the Babylonians, the philosophy of the Hindus, the art and ideas of beauty and democracy of the Greeks, the laws and system of colonial rule of the Romans. We have in our form of government some of the ideas of the ancient Britons and Teutons. We make use of the scientific discoveries of the Moorish Arabs in mathematics, of the Italians in painting and sculpture, of the Celts in poetry, art, and missionary zeal."

Thought-provoking questions at the end of each chapter bring out clearly the relation of past to present.

The Gateway to American History really does more than relate the story of the past; it makes even young children realize that history is continuous and that they are, in a sense, the heirs to all that has gone before.

Fr. P. J. Chandlery, S.J., whose *Pilgrim Walks in Rome* is so deservedly esteemed, has been making similar walks in London and the result is presented to us in *The Tower to Tyburn* (Sands & Co.). A careful and detailed description of the Tower, with special reference to its hallowed Catholic associations, illustrated by ample pictures and plans is followed by an itinerary from the Tower to Tyburn full of interesting lore. St. Dunstan in the East, St. Magnus the Martyr, the Cheapside Cross, Mercers' and Goldsmiths' Halls, old St. Paul's, and many more centres of Catholic memory, right away to Tyburn, come into review.

The Land of St. Francis Assisi, by Gabrielle Faure. (Boston; The Medici Society.)

Art lovers will revel in this book. It covers the Umbrian country that Francis loved, the fields of Bevagna, the churches and towns of Perugia and Assisi. There are more than 150 pictures, and they are beautifully executed. The imprint of the Medici Society is sufficient guarantee of this.

A Dictionary of Secret and Other Societies, compiled by Arthur Preuss. (St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co.)

For many years Mr. Preuss has specialized in secret societies, and he has accumulated a vast amount of information concerning their organization and aims, all of which he has now collected into this valuable volume. As he remarks in the preface, "for obvious reasons all specifically Catholic societies, as well as societies consisting exclusively of Catholics and having the ecclesiastical approbation, have been excluded." The book is for the information of Catholics, especially the clergy, in regard to the myriad

net-work of affiliations outside the Church. The *Dictionary* is not limited to secret or quasi-secret societies, it begins with the Acacia Fraternity, runs down through the Gideons and the Lady True Blues and ends with the Zuzimites. Mr. Preuss has in view a new edition of his work and asks his readers to favor him with corrections and additional information they may happen to possess.

Memoirs of Missionary Priests, by Bishop Challoner. Revised and corrected by John Hungerford Pollen, S.J. Pp. 642. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, London).

There can be no more inspiring reading for an English Catholic than this famous book of Bishop Challoner. Both in arrangement and make-up the volume is thoroughly satisfactory. It is of special significance to students of American Church History, as Bishop Challoner was identified with the beginnings of Catholicism in this country.

On Miracles and Some Other Matters, by Sir Bertram Windle, M.D., F.R.S., Pp. 186. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, London).

This is a collection of eight essays upon subjects which lie on the borderland of theology and natural science, prefaced by a charming sketch of the late Fr. Ignatius Ryder, of the Birmingham Oratory, who was for many years an intimate friend of the author. Sir Bertram Windle is a scientist of such undisputed eminence that he speaks with authority, and at the same time is a Catholic of such unquestioned orthodoxy that he is able to laugh at the cavillings of those who think religion and science at variance, or—more futile still—who seek to "reconcile" them.

The author discusses briefly the miracles of Lourdes from the medical standpoint; exposes in scathing terms the inaccuracies of Draper's *"Conflict between Religion and Science"*; discusses the religion of prehistoric man; sums up in attractive fashion what is known about Mithraism in its relations with pagan Rome and with early Christianity; and is equally instructive and interesting in various other subjects. Few volumes of its modest size contain such a wealth of opportune and up-to-date information upon vital subjects.

The Miracles of King Henry VI (Cambridge: The University Press) is a complement to Cardinal Gasquet's *The Religious Life of Henry VI* (Bell, London). The volume, edited by Father Knox and Shane Leslie gives the Latin text of the miracles with an English translation and a careful introduction dealing analytically with the original from a religious point of view. It is of great value though its direct historical interest is not so great as Cardinal Gasquet's volume.

The Early Correspondence of John Salisbury, by Reginald Lane Poole (The Oxford University Press, New York) brings to light much

valuable material regarding one of the most interesting characters of the twelfth century. He was secretary to Thomas à. Becket, was with him during the Archbishop's exile in France, returned with him to England and witnessed his martyrdom. The writings of John of Salisbury are remarkable for great erudition, notably the *Metalogicus*, in four books wherein he defends the studies of the medieval schools against the sneers of the ignorant. His mission to Pope Adrian IV was of singular importance, and his name occurs in connection with the much-discussed Bull, "Laudabiliter".

The Emperor Charles IV (1316-1378): A Study in Holy Roman Imperialism, by Gerald Groveland Walsh, S.J. (D. Appleton & Co., New York). This is an unusual type of book. Within brief compass we have an excellent biography of a ruler who has been somewhat of an enigma to students of ecclesiastical history and an insight into the political difficulties of a critical period in the Holy Roman Empire which, says the author, "has been at times strangely misunderstood." He says further: "Its purpose was the peace of Europe, its principle was the doctrine of Authority, its basis was the geographical identity of the old Roman Empire and the Catholic Church, its sanction was the Will of God and the criterion of its legitimacy was the natural law. Its history began with Charles the Great, although its theory was not completed until the days of Charles IV. It was of course not an institution, nor a nation, but an ideal and a faith."

Father Betten, S.J., of John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio, is laying us under heavy obligations. His latest work, *Historical Facts and Terms* (Allyn and Bacon, New York and Boston) is intended as a Reference Book for students of history, "to relieve teachers and ambitious students of the necessity of looking up, in larger histories, encyclopedias, etc., explanations of points which in the current history textbooks can only be touched upon, while more copious elucidations would be desirable." We hope that in the event of another edition some other titles will be added, and the author kindly invites suggestions.

The Evolution of French Canada, by Jean Charlemagne Bracq, Litt.D., LL.D. (The Macmillan Company, New York). The author aims "to set forth how 65,000 vanquished French colonists, abandoned by France at the cession, treated unjustly by early English settlers and place-holders, have become a people of over 3,000,000 who have evolved a civilization of their own of singular interest."

The Roman Occupation of Britain, by F. Heverfield, revised by George Macdonald (At the Clarendon Press, Oxford).

This is a presentation in book form of Professor Heverfield's series of lectures under the Ford Foundation at Oxford, delivered in the spring

term of 1907. The editor, Mr. Macdonald, tells us that "the author had always looked forward to publishing them" after a recasting. The volume as originally planned aimed at providing the general reader with a trustworthy introduction to the problem of Roman Britain, but as now issued "it has a further purpose", and becomes a tribute from the University of Oxford to the memory of William Camden.

It is an excellent bit of workmanship from every angle. It is profusely illustrated, contains an extensive bibliography and a valuable index.

Alaska: A History of its administration, exploitation, and industrial development during its first half century under the Rule of the United States, by Jeannette Paddock Nichols, Ph.D. (The Arthur H. Clark Company, Cleveland) is a volume noteworthy as a study in American Imperialism. It purports to be "based entirely on previously unexplored original sources which have been painstakingly examined, checked, and evaluated", and it reveals some rather unsavoury political transactions whose devious methods are set forth by Dr. Nichols in the light of their own statements. It has a lengthy and illuminating introduction by the Honorable James Wickersham, an eminent authority on Alaska and its problems.

A History of the Foreign Policy of the United States, by Randolph Adams, Ph.D. (The Macmillan Company, New York) is a scholarly survey of the foreign relations of the United States presented from a new and entertaining point of view that will appeal to the scholar and the general reader. It focuses attention on those great principles of international association and carefully analyzes present day problems and policies in the light of historical precedents.

Cables and Wireless by George Abel Schreiner (The Stratford Publishing Company, Boston, Mass.) "is a study of international policy regarding the laying and operation of submarine telegraph lines, or cable lines" The volume has an introduction by Edward F. McSweeney, LL.D., which explains it purport.

The Training of Writers, by Edward F. Garesché (The Macmillan Company, New York) offers "some suggestions and observations which will be of help both to the teacher who is rightly ambitious of developing writers from among his pupils, and to the advanced students themselves who can utilize some of the suggestions given to help themselves forward in the path of practical writing." The book, so the author states is an amplified form of a series of articles which have appeared in *The Catholic Journal,* of Milwaukee.

Thomas Chandler Haliburton ("Sam Slick"), by V. L. O. Chittick, PhD., (The Columbia University Press, New York) is an attractive biography of the man who is regarded as "the father of American humor." It

contains copious extracts from Haliburton's works which constitute an anthology of his humorous and satirical comment. Dr. Chittick seems to have discovered that the Canadian idol has feet of clay.

Chateaubriand at the Crossways, by Henry Powell Spring, Ph.D., (Columbia University Press, New York) is a critical study of Chateaubriand's character as reflected in the *Essai sur les Révolutions*. The author assures us that the point of view of study "is one rather of personal judgment than of technical analysis."

The Gadsden Treaty, by Paul Neff Gerber, Ph.D. (Press of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia) is a doctoral thesis dealing with one of the neglected topics in the history of American relations with the Republic of Mexico, which from its formation to the present has been a record of constant diplomatic strife, and an occasional resort to arms. The author's conclusions are that the Gadsden treaty "can be viewed partly as a business deal between the two nations and partly as a result of the American expansionist tendencies in the period, 1840-1860.....It immediately became the basis for new diplomatic issues between the two nations, and it proved a failure as an instrument for a better relationship between the sister republics, and a definitive statement of the Mexican question."

Bohemond I, Prince of Antioch (The Princeton University Press) is a posthumous publication of data gathered by Ralph Bailey Yewdale, for his degree at Princeton. The editor says: "Yewdale had assembled the material for this thesis, and had written the first draft, but had actually revised only a few pages in the type-written form.....This task has been confined to making the corrections in the manuscript which were inevitable. Love for a former student and companion, respect for his scholarship, would not permit any attempt to add aught to his work." Students on medieval history and especially of the critical period within the borders of the Italian peninsula following upon the advent of Robert Guiscard will find this a most valuable work. Apart from its historicity it is attractive as literature, but we caution the tyro to provide himself with a lexicon which is not of the abridged variety.

History of England and the British Commonwealth, by Laurence M. Larson (Henry Holt and Company, New York) is a recent publication of "The American Historical Series" edited by Professor Haskins of Harvard University. This work evidently has been designed to meet the requirements of the American student of English history who seeks a broad survey of the subject. Thus the volume of facts is reduced as the author believes that "a leading purpose" in a course of general English history "is to give the student some insight into the process of historic development, and to help him to understand how the various forms of national

life have come to be." The author is happy in his omissions and properly subordinates the political narrative.

Les Romanesques, par Edmond Rostand, edited by Henry LeDaum, vocabulary by Noëlia Durule (Ginn and Company, Boston) is a handy little volume prepared for schools and colleges by a teacher who has been "impressed by the poetic excellence and dramatic genius of Edmond Rostand, the beauty and freshness of his plays, and their general educational merit. Like all publications of Ginn and Company the book is very attractively made and printed on excellent paper. A detailed introduction contains a brief biography and a dramatic review of the play.

The Bolshevik Persecution of Christianity, by Captain Francis McCullagh (E. P. Dutton and Company, New York) does not deal exhaustively with the persecution of Christians by the Soviet Government of Russia, as the title seems to indicate. The author tells us that it touches merely on the fringe of that vast subject. He states: "work which would present a full picture of these persecutions would have to be as large as the work which M. Paul Allard devotes to the persecutions under Diocletian, and would have to be written by one who had more time at his disposal than I have; by one, moreover who was a trained historical writer and not merely a working journalist compelled by the circumstances of his life to travel continuously abroad and to write copiously for the daily press."

Captain McCullagh quotes as some of the defiances which the Soviet leaders have hurled at the world—"Religion is an opium to the people," "We have finished with the earthly Tsars; now we shall deal with the heavenly Tsars," "The teaching of religious belief in State or private educational establishments to children of tender age and to minors is punishable by forced labor for a period not exceeding one year."

He has covered in a most graphic manner the outstanding features of the subject; and his testimony is of indisputable value.

The *Pilgrimage of Robert Langton*, transcribed with an introduction and notes, by E. M. Blackie, B.A., Chaplain to the King, Archdeacon of Stow, Canon and Precentor of Lincoln Cathedral (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.) is a book of unusual content and briefly is an account of a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. James at Compostella by an English priest in "The .xiii. yere of ye regne of kynge Henry the .viii". It is of little historical value, but will be appreciated by the bibliophile as a sample of typographical work of the period.

Der Deutsche Luther im Weltkrieg und in der Gegenwort, by Hartmann Grisar, S.J. (Haas and Grabherr, Augsburg) is the latest volume on a subject which Dr. Grisar has made peculiarly his own. He is without exception the greatest authority on Luther, and his major work on the sub-

ject has been translated. We hope that some scholar who is interested in Luther studies will give us this work in an English dress.

A History of the Tory Party, 1640-1714, by Keith Fieling (At the Clarendon Press, Oxford) is an attempt to construct the history of the first Tory party—its origins in the last age of Queen Elizabeth, its rise from the Civil War, its full development under Charles II and William III, its extinction with the death of Queen Anne, and to portray eighty years of English political history from the point of view of that "other half" which fought, and lost the first great struggle of organized politics in England.

American Economic History, by Harold Underwood Faulkner, Ph.D. (Harper and Brothers, New York and London) is a volume of "Harper's Historical Studies" edited by Guy Stanton Ford who furnishes a brief introduction in which he says: "It is done dispassionately, without disproportion or vain glorification. Those who study it can draw their own conclusions and if they master it will find themselves in possession of the essential equipment necessary to a citizenship that will face in the next generation more complicated social and economic problems than it has in the past."

Western Australia: A History from Its Discovery to the Inauguration of the Commonwealth, by J. S. Battye, Litt. D. (American Branch of the Clarendon Press, New York) is set down as being "the first to give a detailed history of Western Australia from its discovery and exploration to its inclusion in the Australian Commonwealth in 1801." The author has "searched the records" and assures us that "every statement has been verified by documentary evidence, and every care exercised to make the whole work strikingly accurate. The price, $8.35, will debar many from purchasing the volume extremely valuable though it be.

NOTEWORTHY ARTICLES IN CURRENT PERIODICALS

Adam, The New. By M. Bower. (*Verbum Domini*, October).

American History, New Pages in. By Catharine McPartlin. (*Magnificat*, August).

American Isolation, The Myth of. By Pitman B. Potter. (*Current History*, November).

Anatomy And The Ambassador. By James J. Walsh. (*Commonweal*, November).

Anglo-Dutch Alliance of 1678. Part II. By Clyde Laclare Grose. (*English Historical Review*, October).

Anglo-Saxon Myth, The. By Henry J. Ford. (*American Mercury*, September).

Art, The Philosophy of. By M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. (*Blackfriars*, October).

Athenian Generals of the Year 424-3 B. C. Notes on Certain. By Allen B. West. (*American Journal of Philology*, April).

Baptismal Records, Holy Trinity Church. Edited by Rev. F. E. Tourscher, O.S.A. (*Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, June).

Borough Representation in Richard II's Reign. By Miss May McKisack. (*English Historical Review*, October).

Calvary and the Holy Mass, The Sacrifice of. By Vincent McNabb, O. P. (*Blackfriars*, October).

California, The Founder of. By Theodore Maynard. (*Commonweal*, November).

Catholic Church, The, and Anti-Catholic Culture. By Hilaire Belloc. (*Catholic World*, September).

Catholic Church in Central America, Some Statistics of the. By the Rev. Pedro Buissink. (*Ecclesiastical Review*, October).

Catholic Missionary Work among the Colored People of the United States, 1776-1866. By Miriam T. Murphy. (*Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, June).

Catholic Question to the Protestants. By M. Gregory Martin. (*Blackfriars*, October).

Catholic Social Movement in Switzerland. By A. Raybauld. (*Irish Monthly*, October).

Cauldron, The Macedonian Witches'. By Vangel Sugareff. (*Current History*, November).

Child Labor Amendment, The Proposed. By John A. Ryan, D.D. (*Catholic World*, November).

Christian Sociology, Notes on. By E. Cahill. (*The Irish Monthly*, October).

Christian Tradition, The, and the Modern Spirit. By Oliver C. Quick. (*Anglican Theological Review*, October).

Church History Literature 1914-1920. By Gustav Krüger. (*Harvard Theological Review*, July). IV. The Church in modern times: part 1, the period of the Enlightenment.

Civilization and the Civilizers. By Henry Longan Stuart. (*Commonweal*, November).

Clark, George Rodger, The National Significance of. By Temple Bodlay. (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, September).

Colonial Maryland, Religious and Civic. By Mary C. McKenna. (*Truth*, July).

Constitution, The Newest in an Ancient Land. By Richard Coke. (*Current History*, November).

Country Parish, A Model and its Records. By Rt. Rev. Owen Corrigan, D.D. (*Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, September).

De La Taille, Pere and the Last Supper. By Vincent McNabb, O.P. (*Blackfriars*, October).

Democratic Party in 1924, The. By Meredith Nicholson. (*Yale Review*, October).

Denominational History, The Value of. By H. Wheeler Robinson. (*Baptist Quarterly*, July).

Dollier De Casson, L'Abbé, Superieur Du Seminaire De Montreal. Par François Uzureau. (*Le Canada Français*, October).

Don Bernardo de Galvez, Governor of the Province of Louisiana. By C. Robert Churchill. (*Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine*, October).

Eastern European History, The Importance of. By Prof. R. J. Kerner. (*Historical Outlook*, November).

European Diplomacy. The Egyptian Factor in (1798-1898). By J. A. R. Marriott. (*Edinburgh Review*, July).

English Chronicle, The Beginning of the Year in the. By R. H Hodgkin. (*English Historical Review*, October).

Error, The Repression of. By Leslie J. Walker, S.J. (*Catholic World*, November).

Europe, 1890-1898. By G. Lowes Dickinson. (*Contemporary Review*, September).

European Political Boundaries. By S. Columb. Gilfillan. (*Political Science Quarterly*, September). 1500 A.D. to present.

European Settlements on the East Coast of North America. By Joseph W. Barnwell. (*South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, April).

Evesham, The Last Abbott of. By Joseph Clayton. (*Blackfriars*, October).

Far East, The, Two Centuries Ago. By Arthur F. Hort. (*Edinburgh Review*, July).

Film and Futility, The. By John Trent. (*Blackfriars*, October).

Five Nations, A Sketch of the Relations of New York with the. By Joel N. Eno. (*Americana*, July).

Florida, The Faith in. By Marguerite Pace Corcoran. (*Catholic World*, September).

France's New Government and the Church. By Denis Gwynn. (*Blackfriars*, October).

Franciscans, The Coming of the to England, 1224, By Emma G. Salter (*Nineteenth Century*, September).

Gibbon and the First Council of Ephesus. 1. Hilaire Belloc. (*Studies*, Dublin, September).

God and His Purpose. By O. C. Quick. (*Pilgrim*, October).

God-Made and Machine-Made. By John Gray. (*Blackfriars*, October).

Great Britain,The Future of. By Raymond Turner. (*Yale Review*, October).

Greek Scepticism, The Influence of on Greek and Christian Thought in the First and Second Centuries. By Eugene de Faye. (*Hibbert Journal*, July).

Historic Determinism and the Individual. By James T. Adams. (*Atlantic Monthly*, October).

History and Literature. By George Macauley Trevelyan. (*Yale Review*, October).

"Hoc est Corpus Meum." By F. C. Ruffenach. (*Verbum Domini*, October).

Inge, Dean, Artist and Catholic Apologist. By Rev. Thomas Chetwood, S.J. (*Truth*, July).

Innsbruck, Tirol. By Ethna Kavanagh. (*Irish Monthly*, October).

International Relations. By G. P. Gooch. (*Pilgrim*, October).

Ireland, The Races of. By J. A. Lindsey. (*Nineteenth Century*, September).

Irish Round Towers, The. By Rev. Cornelius Mennis, D.D (*Truth*, July).

Islam and Turkish Nationalism. By Snouck Hurgronje. (*Foreign Affairs*, September).

Jerusalem, The Establishment of the Latin Kingdom. By Dana C. Munro. (*Sewanee Review*, July-September).

Kant and Theology. By Robert M. Wenley. (*Anglican Theological Review*, October).

Labour Movement, The 'Materialism' of the. By Stanley B. James. (*Blackfriars*, October).

League of Nations, Catholic Projects for a. By Vera Telfer, B.A. (*Catholic World*, October).

League of Nations in Action, The. By Denys P. Myers. (*Current History*, November).

L'Eglise et de l'Etat, La Séparation de.-III. La Séparation au point de vue juridique. Notion fondamentale.—IV. les pays de Séparation (suite).—A. Van Hove. (*Nouvelle Revue Theologique*, Oct.).

Middle Ages, Secular and Regular Canons During the. By Loren C. MacKinney. (*Princeton Theological Review*, October).

Miscreant Cardinal, The Case of the. By Theodore F. T. Plucknett. (*American Historical Review*, October).

Modern Irish Literature, Obscenity in. By Eoin Ua Mathghamhna. (*Irish Monthly*, October).

Moses. By J. Hom. (*Verbum Domini*, October).

Moslem Ferment in French North Africa. By Elizabeth Knowlton. (*Current History*, November).

Music, Hebrew Liturgical. By R. Galdos. (*Verbum Domini*, October).

Mussolini and the Law. By L. J. S. Wood. (*Commonweal*, November).

Mysticism and Religion. By James H. Leuba. (*Anglican Theological Review*, October).

New Orleans, Notes On The Economic History Of, 1803-1836. By James E. Winston. (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, September).

Old English Church Registers, Items in. By W. B. Hannon. (*Irish Monthly*, September).

Our Lady in Mediaeval Piety. By Fr. Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. (*Ecclesiastical Review*, October).

Parliament and People in Germany. By O. de L. (*Contemporary Review*, September).

Pascal. A Propos Du Tricentenaire De. La Pression Atmosphérique. By Henri Simard. (*Le Canada Francais*, October).

Philip II of Macedon, The Early Diplomacy of. By Allen B. West. (*Numismatic Chronicle*, 1923).

Plenus Comitatua. By William A. Morris. (*English Historical Review*, July).

Psalm 48. By F. Zovell, S.J. (*Verbum Domini*, October).

Psychology, The Significance of for the Study of Politics. By Charles E. Merriam. (*American Political Science Review*, August).

Religious Philosophy, The Person of Christ in Recent. By Casper Wistar Hodge. (*Princeton Theological Review*. October).

Religious Tolerance. By T. Lawrason Riggs. (*Commonweal*, November).

Renaissance, The Church During The. By J. F. Leibell. (*Blackfriars*, October).

Rome, On Alliance with. By Hoffman Nickerson. (*Commonweal*, November).

Rosary, An Old Book on the. By D. O. M. (*Irish Monthly*, October).

Russian History, Prospecting in the Field of. By G. T. Robinson. (*Historical Outlook*, November).

Saints and Scholars. VI. St. Anselm. By Rev. William P. H. Kitchin, PhD. (*Magnificat*, November).

Social and Economical Sciences, Progress in Methods of Inquiry and Research in the. By F. Stuart Chapin. (*Science*, October).

Social Studies for the Junior High School, Building a Course on the. By Dr. D. C. Knowlton. (*Historical Outlook*, November).

Society, The Church's Place in. By Joseph W. Swain. (*Anglican Theological Review*, October).

Scotland, The General Assemblies of. By Sylvester W. Beach. (*Princeton Theological Review*, October).

South American Independence, The Hundredth Anniversary of. By Victor A. Belaunde. (*Current History*, August).

Spain. By Hilaire Belloc. (*Blackfriars*, September).

Spain, 1901-1923. By Charles E. Chapman. (*University of California Chronicle*, July).

Spanish Mystics, The. By Clarence Wentworth. (*Magnificat*, August).

St. Francis, Pictorial Life of. By Johannes Jorgensen. (*Commonweal*, November).

San Francisco, The Founding of. By Michael Williams (*Catholic World*, September).

St. Thomas Aquinas and the Latin Hymns. By Jeanne Marie, (*Magnificat*, October).

Tanit, Lifting the Veil of. By Byron Kuhn de Prorok. (*Commonweal*, November).

Taxation in the Roman State. By Roscoe Pulliam. (*Classical Journal*, June).

Veuillot, Louis. By Henry Longan Stuart. (*Commonweal*, November).

Virgin, The Rejected. By William Vincent. (*Blackfriars*, October).

Western Culture, The Decline of. By W. K. Stewart. Spengler's "Downfall of Western Civilization," explained. (*Century*, September).

Wilhelm II, Ex-Kaiser. Breaks Silence. Authorized Presentation of His Views To-day. (*Current History*, November).

World History, A Month's. Current History Associates. (*Current History*, November).

NOTES AND COMMENT

The Greatest Church Edifice in the Western World.—On a sloping eminence of the campus of the Catholic University of America is now being reared to the glory of the Living God a sacred edifice destined to rank with the historic Cathedrals of Notre Dame, Chartres, Rheims, Seville, Strasburg, Florence and Milan.

Its title is the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception and it is being erected as an eternal monument of the love of American Catholics for the Mother of God under the auspices of the great Institution which has accomplished so much for the Church and Catholic Education. The Shrine is the subject of a graphic article by Will P. Kennedy in a recent issue of the Washington Sunday *Star*. Says Mr. Kennedy:

> This shrine will have the vast over-all length of 465 feet, and its main transept will extend to the great width of 238 feet. Its dome, 90 feet in diameter, will tower to 254 feet. The campanile, or bell tower, will be 322 feet high. The main nave will be 54 feet wide and the side naves 12 feet. It will be capable of holding about 7,000 persons. In the main church there will be no pews to obstruct the view or minimize the vastness of the interior—465 feet long, 54 feet wide and 85 feet high. It will be in the Romanesque style, whose beauties already have been proved in some of the most magnificent churches in Europe.
>
> The sanctuary alone will cost a million dollars. It will accommodate the entire hierarchy of the Catholic Church in America and several hundred additional priests. This fact, with the vast capacity of the main church, will make it the logical scene of the ceremonies of the church in this country.
>
> Three Popes have given conspicuous evidence of their interest in this American cathedral, and one of the most striking embellishments will be a gift from the Holy Father, a mosaic reproduction of "The Immaculate Conception," by Bartolome Esteban Murillo, which will be copied from the original canvas in the Prado gallery at Madrid.
>
> This is the first gift of the kind that any Pope has ever sent to the Western Hemisphere. It will be placed in the sanctuary as a background for the main altar, and will represent years of artistic labor in the famous mosaic works of the Vatican. Pope Benedict XV pledged this gift when he wrote:
>
> "After thus exhorting you, it behooves us now to set an example that will lead our bearers to contribute with pious generosity to this great work of religion, and for this reason we have resolved to ornament the High Altar of this church with a gift of peculiar value. In due time we shall send to Washington an image of the Immaculate Conception made by our command in the

Vatican mosaic workshop, which shall be at once a proof of our devotion toward Mary Immaculate and our good will toward the Catholic University."

Word has just been received from Rome regarding this masterpiece of mosaic art. Count Muccioli, director of the studio of mosaics in the Vatican, has finished the cartoons which will serve as models for the painting in oils, from which the mosaic will be reproduced. The cartoons were made from the original painting, which Count Muccioli was sent by the Pope to Madrid especially to make.

While the gift was the plan of Pope Benedict XV, the death of that pontiff prevented his keeping his pledge, but Pius XI respected it.

His Holiness sent for Count Muccioli and asked him to bring all the best photographs of the originals of Murillo. After an attentive examination, in which Pius XI gave proof of his fine artistic sense, he chose the Immaculate Conception "La Purissima Bionda," which is kept in the Prado Museum of Madrid, as the model for the mosaic destined for the Washington Shrine.

There are two paintings of the Immaculate Conception by this painter in the Prado Museum—"La Purissima Bruna" and "La Purissima Bionda," so called from the color that the artist gave to the hair of the Virgin. There is a replica of the "Bruna" by the same Murillo in the Muse du Louvre in Paris. "The Bruna" has a great number of little angels around the figure of the Virgin, 25 in all. The "Bionda," instead, has only five, but the picture of the Madonna, in both face and figure, is much more perfect than the other.

The Pope, having chosen this picture, told Count Muccioli to go to Madrid to take an exact copy. He also instructed the artist to take every care, so that the work might be worthy

Count Muccioli left after a few days, furnished with a diplomatic passport by the secretary of state and a letter of introduction to the archbishop, Mgr. Frederico Tedeschini, apostolic nuncio at Madrid. At the Spanish capital the artist sent by the Pope was received with every respect, and the secretary of state, through Signor Leanitz, representing the Department of Education, ordered that he should be treated with the greatest consideration, so that he might easily accomplish his work. His task was finished in three weeks, and Count Muccioli returned to Rome bringing a true copy painted by himself on canvas, a really faithful reproduction, not only in design but also in color.

The dimensions for the mosaic, sent from Washington, are 2.75 by 1.90 meters. The mosaics, therefore, will be larger than the original at the Prado; in this the figures are a little under life-size, while they will be a little above in the mosaic.

Count Muccioli thinks that the copy in oils will be ready by

the end of the present year. A reproduction in mosaics will require at least a year and a half to complete. Probably in three years the work will be ready for shipment to Washington.

While the studio of mosaics of the Vatican always has in stock a large reserve of enamels of all qualities and colors for such works, many new enamels of very fine colors, such as are merged in the delicate works of the great and gentle Murillo, are to be fused specially for the mosaic destined for the Washington shrine.

Another outstanding art work which in chaste simplicity is intended to be a first appeal to all visitors is a heroic aluminum statue of "Our Lady of Washington," selected from among nearly 5,000 of the artist's most beautiful attempts to visualize the Mother of God, to be the patroness of this shrine. It is to be erected in front of the new cathedral. A light will always shine on this statue.

After all parts of Europe had been covered and more than 4,000 different copies of the Madonna obtained, among them the most famous in the world, "Our Lady of Washington," at the Catholic University, was chosen as patroness of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception.

From the day the National Shrine was first contemplated it was determined that in point of artistry it should be the most beautiful in the world. In carrying out this thought, Bishop Shahan and Father McKenna determined that the patroness of the National Shrine should be the most perfect type of Madonna that could be found.

After carefully examining all these art works, Bishop Shahan and Father McKenna were not satisfied. While passing through Caldwell Hall, one of the main buildings at Catholic University, they halted before the statue of "Our Lady of Washington," which had stood before the chapel since 1889. They viewed the statue from every angle. The search was ended. Here was embodied everything they sought from an ecclesiastical and artistic viewpoint.

"Our Lady of Washington" was erected in Caldwell Hall as patroness of the Catholic University, in 1889.

This remarkable figure of Our Lady is beautiful from every angle. The face is exquisitely chiseled, like a Botticelli Madonna. The head is meekly bowed in prayer, the hands are clasped, the folds of drapery are sculptured with a grace rare even in a Donatello, and under her feet the Blessed Virgin crushes the serpent, symbolic of St. John's vision in the Apocalypse.

It is believed by those who have made a special study of the Madonna in art that this statue of "Our Lady of Washington" will soon be as famous as "Our Lady of Nuremberg," attributed to the early sculptor, Peter Vischer.

The High Altar in the main church will be the gift of priests of

the United States, and rich embellishment will make it a masterpiece of art. Surrounding this altar will be 15 chapels in honor of the mysteries of the Rosary. American soldiers and sailors who fell in the great war will be commemorated in the largest chapel of the main church.

The foundation stone of the cathedral was laid at one of the greatest religious ceremonies ever held in America, on September 23, 1920. Cardinal Gibbons officiated—the last public official act that he performed—and Cardinal O'Connell, the personal representative of the Pope at the recent Holy Name convention, was in attendance.

Officials of the United States Government, officers of the Army and Navy, ambassadors of foreign countries and eminent members of the Catholic hierarchy were present. Twenty thousand persons thronged the university campus. The Pope cabled his blessing, and Cardinal Bourne of England cabled Cardinal Gibbons a special message of congratulation.

Embassies represented were those of England, France, Italy. Russia, Japan, Brazil, Argentina, Chile and Peru. Ministers of Bulgaria, Cuba, Guatemala, Honduras, Poland, Siam, Serbia, Venezuela and charge d'affaires of Belgium, Bolivia, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and Greece, The Netherlands, Panama, Rumania and Switzerland were also present, also the counselor of China. Canada was represented by Sir François Lemieux, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Quebec. American representatives were Justice Joseph McKenna of the Supreme Court, Admiral W. S. Benson, chairman of the Shipping Board, Admiral McGowan, Maj. Gen. Tasker S. Bliss, Brig. Gen. I. W. Littell and Col. H. P. Birmingham of the Soldiers' Home, with a delegation of five veterans of the Indian and five veterans of the Civil War.

The crypt, which is merely a corner of the basement under the main church, is in itself a gem of architecture and religious decoration, amazing to the visiting thousands, and a symbol of promise of the greater work—the basilica itself.

From this crypt the layman, unversed in the intricacies of the vast project, may gain some vision of what the shrine itself is to be. It is 204 feet long, 160 feet wide and 23 feet high in the clear. Capable of accommodating 2,000 persons, containing 15 altars, itself an exquisite edifice, it is but a portion, as it were, of the whole scheme. In point of fact, its roof will be the main floor of the Shrine itself. And extending away before it is the sketching of the lines the remainder of the structure will follow, dwarfing the great work already done.

On the crypt alone $400,000 thus far has been spent, not counting the site, which was donated by the trustees of the Catholic University. Another $200,000 will go into it before its completion.

If the scope of the Crypt gives an idea of the vast size of the shrine itself, there is here also a hint of the magnificence, and particularly of the wealth of symbolism, that will mark the entire structure.

In the Crypt beneath the main church the High Altar and fifteen lesser altars will represent incidents in the life of the Blessed Virgin. The High Altar will be dedicated to her under the title "Our Lady of the Catacombs." In the title is the keynote of the decorative treatment of the Crypt. Accordingly, there will be reproduced striking features of the religious art of the catacombs—frescoes and mosaics picturing the Madonna and the Divine Child.

"Our Lady of the Catacombs" will occupy the space beyond the high altar, and the columns of each of the lesser altars will represent famous national shrines of the old and the new world—Italy by "Our Lady of the Snow"; France by "Our Lady of Chartres"; England, by "Our Lady of Walshingham"; the Orient, by "Our Lady of Ephesus"; the United States, by "Our Lady of Maryland"; Spain, by "Our Lady of Tinos"; Norway, by "Our Lady of Bergen"; Switzerland, by "Our Lady of Einseideln", and Germany, by "Our Lady of Kevelar."

The tiled vault is in four arches, each 54 feet wide, and in each are to appear five medallion scenes from the life of the Blessed Virgin and her types, taken from the sacred Scriptures and from the oldest Catholic traditions. The ceilings are of rich Guastavino, with mosaic inserts, and the groining of the arches above the altars is covered with symbols of the earliest Christian ideas, in gilt and colored ceramic. It has been termed a "pictorial theology of the first three centuries after Christ."

The High Altar is to be of Algerian onyx and most of the 15 chapels are to be dedicated to the Holy Family and the famous virgin martyrs of the church, such as Cecilia and Agnes.

The greatest story of the Crypt, however, is its series of 62 marble columns, gathered from all parts of the world. Of almost every known variety of marble, they contrast in their blacks, reds, browns and yellows, yet harmonize into a soft yet striking symphony. Spain, Switzerland, Italy, France, Germany, England, Belgium and other lands have contributed to this remarkable symposium. Alaska has sent its best in a beautiful light gray, with graceful cross-veins of darker hue. South America is represented and many of the States of our country. Perhaps the most notable is a sheer column of Mexican onyx, rarely seen in such a large specimen. Its delicate white, here translucent, there creamy, is crossed by a rich tracery of red veins.

Eight granite columns, weighing 10 tons each, help to support the broad vault. Their capitals weigh three tons each and the plinths one ton. Four of these great columns are mahogany granite from South Dakota and four are blue-black Norway

granite, seldom, if ever before, turned into columns. Six other notable columns are of lovely Irish rose. All but three of these columns are already in place. The wainscoting is of mouse-colored marble from the St. Genevieve quarries of Missouri.

The 15 lunette windows of the crypt are of stained glass, each bearing two slender figures of those prophets of the Old Testament, who foretold the office and dignity of the Mother of God. They are perfect in color and design, and rank among the finest specimens of modern pictorial glass. Over all, in the center of the vault, where the arches converge, there will be a great gold star, typical of the Star of Bethlehem.

The first mass in the Crypt was celebrated on Easter Sunday, 1924, by Rev. Dr. McKenna, and on that occasion Bishop Shahan preached the sermon.

At the opening of the Holy Name Convention mass was said in this Crypt by Bishop Shahan. This inaugurated a new phase of the work, as tens of thousands of visitors saw and realized for the first time the vast proportions and the magnificent scale on which the structure is being erected.

The next step in the building program is one not contemplated until recently. It comprehends the extension of the basement floor from the Crypt, the addition to be 100 by 200 feet, directly under the dome and forming the basement of the transept.

This is to be divided into four halls, approximately 40 by 85 feet. One of these will be used for a Marianna Library, books on the Blessed Virgin. This will contain works by various English, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and Celtic, writers, together with many in the Oriental languages. Already friends of the enterprise in Constantinople are making a complete collection of these, which will soon be sent to Washington.

Three of the Roman cardinals have taken a personal interest in the work and have already sent several rare editions of Marianna books. Spain, which always has been renowned for its devotion to the Blessed Virgin, under the title of "The Immaculate Conception," is not behindhand in its interest in this American National Shrine of the Blessed Virgin. Already friends in Seville, Madrid, Barcelona, Saragossa and Valladolid are eager to help in this unique collection. Especially was this the case with the Carmelites of Burgos in northern Spain.

A second hall will be given over to an art museum of the Blessed Virgin Mother, containing copies of famous paintings, sculpture, medals and medallions gathered from all over the world. Many of the originals are in the Vatican, while the Louvre, Paris and the Prado in Madrid, as well as the famous collections in Seville, will be represented.

The third hall will contain a replica of "The Grotto at Lourdes," where the Virgin Mother appeared to the devout peasant

girl Bernadette saying: "I am the Immaculate Conception." This grotto is to be a donation from a devout client of Mary Immaculate.

The fourth hall will be used as a place where a lunch can be provided for those who come on a pilgrimage and go to Holy Communion.

The corridors intersecting these halls will be provided with copies of the various shrines, such as Lourdes, Loretto, Pompeii and Guadeloupe, in Mexico.

All of the work now in progress—the Art-gem Crypt and the extension with the four halls—is in the basement and behind the dome.

It is now certain that the Crypt will be completed in all its adornments, as well as its structural features, within a year.

It is the desire and purpose of those directing the work that the walls of the entire edifice run to their full height before the celebration of the diamond jubilee of the Immaculate Conception, 75 years after 1854—which means December 8, 1929, or five years hence. This is the first announcement that such early progress on the building is contemplated.

The National Shrine is being built by voluntary contributions of money and jewels from all directions.

With each gift there is a story, often of sorrow, nearly always filled with intense human drama, and ever bedded in deepest piety. Here it is the fulfillment of a vow or a pledge to a departed loved one; there it is a pious offering that a wish may be granted.

These things of erstwhile human value will nearly all be melted up to make the sacred vessels of the Shrine. Already seven chalices have been moulded from the precious metals that have been donated.

In the center of the Crypt was erected a more than life-size representation in bronze of the crucifixion—the supreme sacrifice of all times—executed by an Italian artist who was a "Prix de Rome" man. To be placed eventually on the main altar, this effigy of the God-Man giving His life on the cross for the redemption of the sins of man, has inspired all who have taken part in rearing the temple about it.

The inspiration for this National Shrine came at the time of the second plenary council of the Catholic Church, at Baltimore in 1866. At that time Mary Immaculate was declared the special patroness of the Catholic Church in the United States. At the same time, a fitting architectural symbol of this dedication was mentioned.

Priests are still living who remember that at the third plenary council, also at Baltimore, many believed that a great church should be erected in the National Capital to commemorate the traditional devotion of North American Catholics to the Blessed

Virgin. When the Catholic University of America was founded, in 1889, and Mary Immaculate was proclaimed its patroness, the idea became more insistent as the apparent need for a University Church was discussed.

However, there were drawbacks, and a project of such pretentiousness needed many years of consideration and planning to emerge in its proper perspective. Accordingly, it was not until 1912 that Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, rector of the Catholic University, aided by many Catholic ladies of Washington, New York and other cities, undertook the great task and the project assumed real national significance. Immediately it was finally decided upon, however, there was a hearty response from all over the country. Bishop Shahan since that time has been the guiding spirit. As professor of history in the Catholic University for over 25 years, he has been familiar with all the famous churches of the world, and with the ideas and ideals which prompted their erection. As a consequence, it is not surprising that he should have taken the lead in the construction of such a monument. From the beginning of his career in the university this purpose has been in his mind, and what is now apparent is but a fraction of all that he has already accomplished in that direction.

Sharing honors and the hard physical, as well as mental, grind of rearing the basilica with Bishop Shahan is Rev. Bernard A. McKenna, D.D., who is actively in charge of the work 365 days in the year. Father McKenna was appointed secretary to Bishop Shahan in 1915, and the bishop at once intrusted to him the task of collecting the necessary money for the work on the Shrine.

Rev. Dr. McKenna took hold with such sagacity and energy, devoting himself to every other department of the Shrine project, as well as the raising of money, that he is now the director of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. He knows every intricacy of the construction; he is a chief counselor when plans are considered. Always an ardent student of the life, the symbolism and the vast collection of art and literature that have come to surround the Blessed Virgin, he has, since his appointment, intensified his study until he is one of the foremost students of Mariology. He is collecting the statues and pictures and the great library of Mary which will form an integral part of the Shrine project.

In the hands of these two—Bishop Shahan and his able assistant—lie all the intricate threads of the vast undertaking. Asked why a larger organization is not maintained to relieve him and his assistant of some of the duties, Bishop Shahan replies that the work is not yet far enough advanced to be distributed from the hands of these two. The idea is to keep the work centered, unified and harmonized in few minds, that it may preserve its symmetry.

Education Week at the Catholic University.— Education Week was observed at the Catholic University of America with two mass meetings in the Administration Building presided over by the Rector, the Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan. Classes were suspended during the periods set aside for the meetings which were attended by the members of the Faculty, heads of the various religious houses connected with the University and the student body.

The program included the following addresses: "Private Schools in American Education," the Rev. Dr. Patrick J. McCormick, head of the Department of Education; "Physical Education," the Rev. Dr. Edward B. Jordan; "Need of Enlightened Citizenship," the Rev. Leo L. McVay; "The Constitution and the Private School," the Rt. Rev. Monsignor Edward A. Pace, Director of Studies; "The Peculiar Service of the Catholic High School and College," the Rev. John R. Rooney, and "Mutual Relations of Teacher and Pupil," the Rev. Dr. George Johnson.

Discussing the historical status of the private school in America, Dr. McCormick ridiculed the contention that such schools are out of place in American society.

"To ascertain the place of the private schools in American education we should first look to our American educational history," he said. "The private school is America's oldest school. The first schools opened within the present territory of the United States were church schools, and while that of the Dutch Reformed Church in New York is usually referred to as the oldest, we can point to the missionary schools of the Franciscans in Florida and New Mexico as early as 1629, antedating by three or four years the earliest schools conducted under Protestant auspices in the colonies, a fact of no small importance to Catholics as showing that we were first on the ground with our educational work."

"How preposterous is the assumption that the private schools are inimical to the best interests of our democracy," the speaker continued. "In school history it is America's oldest institution; it has proved its worth in training America's leaders in the past and is today charged with the formation of the larger portion of the leaders of tomorrow."

Talking on the "Need for Enlightened Citizenship," Fr. McVay declared: "What the Deposit of Faith is to the Catholic Church, the Constitution of the United States is to our nation."

"The Citizen of the United States is a sovereign," he said, "and at the same time a subject. In this he is like a member of the Catholic Church, whose religion teaches him to be a protector of the truths of faith and at the same time an obedient servant of the laws based thereon. From her ranks her leaders have been and can be chosen. The same law binds the officers as those over whom they preside. In this respect the institutions of the Catholic Church are eminently republican. In this historic church and in her teaching much can be found that will be helpful in equipping the citizen for his duty as a subject of the law.

Very Much Alive.—Educational faddists have been "burying" Latin for

more than a generation; its obsequies have been held *magno cum strepitu, magna comitante caterva.* The "corpse" refuses to say Amen after the interment. Says the New York *Times:*

> Latin, the "dead language" that refuses to die, is enjoying a popularity which is in striking contrast to what was prophesied for it by its detractors six or seven years ago. Even advance-dated modernity does not spurn its use. The recent report of the American Classical League on the investigation which it conducted in more than 2,000 high schools in this country during a period of three and a half years establishes beyond a doubt the holding power of Latin in secondary education.
>
> The investigation revealed that 940,000, or fully 30 per cent. of the total enrollment of students in all secondary schools during the year 1923-1924, took Latin and that this number exceeded by 16,000 the combined total of pupils who studied other foreign languages. This army of Latin students is being trained by a small force of 23,500 teachers, half of whom are called upon to give instruction in one or more other subjects. The crowding of Latin pupils into school courses has served to emphasize as never before the existence of an acute shortage of trained Latin teachers, probably the greatest problem that confronts classical education in America.
>
> The dominant position of Latin in the high school curriculum has been deprecated in the strongest terms. Its necessity has been denied and its abandonment advocated by many, among them scholars and educators of note, who saw such a change toward making secondary education conform more closely to modern requirements. On April 26, 1918, a public debate on the value of Latin was held between Dr. Andrew F. West, Dean of the Graduate School of Princeton University, and Professor David Snedden of Teachers' College, Columbia University. The latter criticized the policy of giving Latin a favored place among high school subjects and called such a policy a distinct obstacle to the development of an effective scheme of liberal education. Professor Snedden argued against Latin in the name of modern culture, which, he said, few individuals possessed in a country that was greatly in need of liberally educated leaders.
>
> Professor Gonzalez Lodge of Columbia University, one of the Advisory Committee of the Classical League, believes there is a renewed interest in the classics, especially Latin, due to the general disillusionment with the aims of "efficiency" and "practicality" which education was forced to adopt in recent years. Germany until the war was regarded as the most practically developed and efficiently organized nation in existence. But people began to realize that if her practical and materialistic education could lead Germany to no better results than were made apparent in her

recent political experiences, then such an education was a failure and a return to the old ideals of education with their emphasis on the humanistic studies was desirable.

The war, says Professor Lodge, produced a general reaction against the materialistic conception of education. It revealed the shortcomings of our school system. It showed how inadequately the background of the pupil was cared for, and that too much stress was laid on the pursuit of "practical" studies. All this combined to keep the study of Latin in the curriculum of our schools.

Within the last twenty years a steady and intensive campaign has been conducted in this country against the accepted usefulness of classical training. The American Classical League has been organized to combat it. Its constituent members, the various classical associations in this country, have undertaken a thorough inquiry into the various phases of the study of Latin—its relation to English, the relation of the Roman political system to our own, of Roman history to American liberties, of Roman institutions to our own social fabric. The fruit of this inquiry has been a large body of facts gathered, systematized and placed before the public. It has been established that Latin plays a prominent part in the language of every-day life. Even in advertising investigation has shown an astonishing number of classical allusions used in advertising products. Practically all of our modern civilization has a classical background.

The American Classical League, with the financial assistance of the General Education Board, investigated all phases of the study of Latin in high schools. Its aim was first to find the facts as they were, then to analyze and interpret them without partiality, and finally to present a constructive and workable program to be followed in the teaching of Latin in secondary schools. The work was carried on by 8,595 teachers throughout the country, who gave their services free. They were assisted by forty-eight professors of education and psychology, who studied and interpreted the findings. A total of 750,000 individual tests were given to 150,000 high school pupils. The investigation afforded an opportunity for testing claims made that students taking Latin could spell better, understood classical illusions more readily, knew the meaning and derivation of words better, had a better feeling for literature, thought more logically or made better citizens. The league investigators believe their findings have proved these assertions to be true.

The greatest handicap in the Latin situation is the lack of qualified teachers. Up to two years ago few new teachers were added to the woefully inadequate supply of instructors in Latin. On the other hand, the demand for them all over the country has been constantly growing. Columbia University has been unable

to supply half the number of teachers it could have placed. This year there is a much larger registration of students who intend to take up the teaching of Latin. But the increase is not large enough to change the situation. Special inducements and incentives will have to be provided to bring about an adequate supply of Latin teachers.

The *Washington Post* says editorially:

> All devotees of the Muse will rejoice at the report of the American classical league. After a most exhaustive survey of the educational field in this country, it finds that there are approximately 940,000 Latin students in the secondary schools, representing 27.5 per cent of all students in that grade. The Latin enrollment, moreover, is larger than the total number of those studying all other languages. Greek progresses more slowly, claiming but 11,000 students.
>
> Of the 20,500 secondary schools in the United States, the league finds that about 83 per cent, or 17,015 offer instruction in one or more foreign or "dead" languages. Those offering four years of Latin more than double the number which boast the customary three years of French. Thus colleges that insist upon a solid grounding in Latin have no need for amending their rule. At present 214 require two to four years preparation in the subject for admission to the A. B. course.
>
> There are 609 colleges and universities in this country, according to the report of the United States Bureau of Education for 1922-1923. In them there are approximately 40,000 "Romans" and 16,000 "Athenians."

And Latin is even discovered to be a great aid to students!

Says the Washington *Star*:

> The conclusion that Latin students surpass non-Latin students in mastery of other subjects has been reached by the American Classical League and the Bureau of Education after a three-year survey of the present day trend and value of classical studies.
>
> "This superiority," the bureau said in reporting the conclusions today, "seem to be due to something gained from the study of Latin rather than to greater initial ability."
>
> Records of 10,000 candidates for college entrance in the last 10 years were cited to show that Latin students fared better by about 13 per cent than non-Latin students in subjects other than Latin and Greek.
>
> The bureau said courses in Latin now are enrolling more high school students than those in all other languages combined, with approximately 22,500 Latin teachers instructing 940,000 students in the secondary schools.

Of course this discovery (?) may be a revelation to a certain class of people, who are not familiar with cultural education. The distinguished College President who launched a campaign in the not distant past against classical education will possibly exclaim with indignation, *"O Tempora, O Mores!"*

Butchering the Bible.— Under this caption the *Washington Post* of date November 10, says editorially:

> It is a strange thing that the people will persist in trying to rewrite the English Bible, not to make a more accurate translation, but to improve its literary qualities, by "simplifying" it, or "popularizing" it, or something of that sort. Invariably such efforts end in failure. We can not recall a single such production that lives, or that deserves to live, as a piece of literature. Yet not a year passes without an addition to the melancholy list.
>
> Last year we had a much-touted new version of the New Testament, which we were told put the work into the familiar language of today, instead of the half-archaic speech of Stuart times. How this was done a single average example of the changes will show. "Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness?" was transmogrified into "Where can we get bread enough in this solitude?" Of course, "wilderness," in the King James version, is a far more familiar word, to apply to a desert place, than the "solitude" which the Biblical rewrite man submitted for it. Yet to say "solitude" instead of "wilderness" was putting the narrative into "a simple, modern style of English, understandable to the average American reader!"
>
> Now comes an English production, in which the Old Testament is "written in the language of the day." Here is a specimen: The verse in the authorized version which reads, "So David dwelt in the fort and called it the city of David" is changed into "David took up his residence in the stronghold; he called it David's-burg." Now, if the verbose, flabby and snobbish "took up his residence" is more the "language of the day" than the terse, explicit "dwelt," then so much worse for the language of the day. To say that to substitute "stronghold" for "fort" is to "cut adrift from archaic words" is simply silly. And as for "David's-burg" instead of "city of David"—at least let us be devoutly thankful that it was not made "Davidsville."
>
> We shall examine this engaging work further. Probably we shall find "Thou shalt not kill" translated into "You are enjoined not to commit manslaughter," Wouldn't that be putting it into the language of the day? And that obscure, archaic passage which runs "God said, Let there be light; and there was light"—surely it should be simplified and popularized; thus: "The Divine Being

directed that the universe, as it then existed, should be illuminated; whereupon a widespread effulgence prevailed."

Simplicity and popularity are what is wanted. To that end, never use a word of one syllable where one of three or four can be employed, and never express an idea in a single word if you can see a chance to ring in four or five. That's the way to butcher our masterpieces of literature, so as to bring them down to the level of the advertisement writers of today.

To this we subjoin the following from the Boston *Pilot*:

The craze for modernizing has impelled some well meaning but misguided scholars outside the Church to expend their energies in an attempt to bring the Bible up to date. The specimens of these attempts that have come to hand all indicate that the experiment has not been a conspicuous success. Judged by the popular reaction as reflected in the editorial comment of the daily press, it has been a dismal failure.

The latest of these attempts is just being subjected to the judgment of the people. It is the work of a Glasgow professor, and purports to be a rendering of the Old Testament into modern English. Viewing the matter merely from the literary standpoint, popular opinion has unhesitatingly decided against translating the classic rendering of the Old or New Testament into the popular speech of the day. Such so-called translations are little more than interpolations. They will not make the Bible more acceptable to mankind.

For every English classic must suffer by being stripped of its rich idiom. Many of the expressions of the Bible have entered into the warp and woof of our present day English speech. They have become a portion of the vernacular tongue.

Many unauthorized translations of the Bible are making the Bible neither more understandable nor more acceptable. They are simply confusing the public mind, garbling the sacred text, and trying to degrade the Holy Scriptures to the level of an ordinary book. More reverence for the Sacred Books of the Bible, instead of more translations of them, is what the world needs today.

The Lingard Society.— This progressive organisation, with aims and purposes similar to those of our American Catholic Historical Association whose annual meeting was held at Philadelphia in the closing days of December, opened its new session, in November under the presidency of His Eminence Cardinal Bourne. An instructive paper was read by Father John Fletcher on "John Lingard."

Reporting the meetings the *Tablet* says:

Father Fletcher said that in calling themselves the Lingard Society they desired to pay honour to the historian to whom English Catholics

owe so great a debt. Seventy years ago an attempt was made by Sir John Acton and others interested in historical research to form a "Lingard Guild," but it failed from want of general support. Now they could congratulate themselves that Lingard's name was attached to a flourishing historical society. The lecturer made some novel suggestions regarding the origin of the Lingard family, and he produced a copy of "Mrs. Lingard's Narrative" used by Tierney in his "Memoir of John Lingard," which has never been published in full and was supposed to be lost. The main facts of Lingard's early life at Winchester and Douay, and his part in the foundation of the new Douay in England, were described. It was pointed out that Lingard was a connecting link between the old and the new order of things, between the foreign seminary and the re-established seminary in England; and at the other end of his life, between the old-style cautious priest who had known the days of persecution and the new ultramontane style of Wiseman. Lingard leapt into the first rank of historians by his book on the Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and it was shown with what care he ensured that it should be scrupulously accurate and contain the latest discoveries. Father Fletcher gave a bird's-eye view of English historiography up to the time of Lingard, pointing out that no synthetic history of England had been written before the eighteenth century. Before Lingard's day history had been the plaything of bitter controversy between Whig and Tory, and both had misrepresented and villified the Catholic religion and its adherents. Sir Robert Walpole was justified in exclaming: "Read me anything but history, for that must be false." Lingard inaugurated a new era. He took as his axiom the old truth—old as Cicero but forgotten—that history must be founded on fact, and that the historian must discover it. He searched, and got others to search, the English and foreign archives that he might depend on original sources, a new departure altogether. He viewed his material as an impartial spectator free from all preconceived theories: he determined to write the unvarnished truth. His object in writing was not only to correct the mistakes of previous historians but to make the Catholic cause appear respectable in the eyes of the British public, who had hitherto been inaccessible to Catholic argument. He succeeded far beyond his hopes. His history superseded that of Hume and remained the most popular sketch of our history until the appearance of Green. The great share which Lingard, as the trusted adviser of the Bishops, had in ecclesiastical affairs in England was pointed out, and the lecture concluded with an account of the social and domestic life of Lingard at Hornby.

Second Centenary of the Apostle of the Abenakis.— The second centenary of Father Sébastien Racle (the misspelled appellation is Rasle) is the subject of an unusually informative article by the indefatigable M. Georges Goyau, of the French Aacdemy, in the *Revue d'Histoire des Missions*, the most recent addition to our list of exchanges. As to the misspelling of the name, M. Goyau says: "Les biographes du Pere, jusqu'ici,

orthographaient son nom *Rasle;* c'est l'orthographe des *Lettres Edifiantes;* nous adoptons celle de son acte de baptéme, dont M. le chanoine Dimanche, archiprêtre de Pontarlier, a bien volu nous commoniquer la copie: *Sebastianus, filius honorabilis Stephani Racle et ejus uxoris Joanna Parrizet, fuit baptizatus die 29e Januarii anno 1652. Susceperunt honorabilis Petrus Racle loco Reverendi Patris Sebastiani Parrizet, ordinis fratrum Augustinorum, et Joanna Francisca filia Stephani Racle...*Cet acte de baptême corrige l'erreur commune des biographes, qui faisent nâitre le Père en 1657. Nous offrons à M. le chanoine Dimanche, pour ce précieux document, nos plus vifs rememciements."

Did space allow, we should be glad to give a lengthy résumé of M. Goyau's splendid article. Perforce we can merely quote a few striking paragraphs.

> La vengeance prévue s'accomplit le 23 aôut 1724. Deux cents Anglais exactement, se dissimulant à la faveur des broussailes s'acheminèrent vers Nanrantsouak: les capitaines Harman, Moulton Bourn, et le lieutenant Bean les commandaient. En route, une quarantaine s' égrenèrent. La petite troupe rencontre Bomaseen; on le tua ainsi que sa fille, et l'on sut, en faisant parler sa femme captive, l'état exact des forces Abenakies. A deux milles de Narantsouak, la troupe se divisa. Harman, avec soixante hommes, se tint aux approches, sans entrer; Moulton, avec cent hommes partagés en trois compagnies, pénetra dans la bourgade. Il semble que, parmi les sauvages, ce subit coup de main produisit une impression d'epouvante; ils firent bientôt au P. de Chasse, supérieur général de la mission, le tragique récit de l'invasion de onze cents Anglais.....les onze cents dont s'effrayaient les sauvages étaient a peine deux cents. Les sauvages racontèrent au P. de Chasse qu'il n'y avait à ce moment—là, dans Nanrantasouak, que cinquante guerriers Abenakis; ils bondirent au-devant de l'ennemi pour laisser aux femmes et aux enfants le temps de s'enfuir. Racle aussi, d'après le récit des Abenakis, courut aux Anglais pour parlementer. Mais une grêle de projectiles s'abbitat sur lui:le missionaire et les sept sauvages qui Entouraient s'affaissèrent au pied d'une croix. Grande debandade alors parmi les Abenakis: les Anglais sans difficulté, pénétrèrent dans l'église, profanèrent le ciboire, profanèrent l'hostie, se retirèrent. Racle était mort. Racle était scalpé, et avec lui, d'après Penhallow, vingt-six sauvages. L'expédition emmenait avec elle quatre prisonniers Indiens et trois Anglais, captifs dans Nanransouak, qu'elle avait libérés. Lorsque le lendemain les Abenakis rentrèrent au village, ils trouvèrent le corps de Racle "percé de mille coups, sa chevelure enlevéé, le crâne enfancé à coupe de hache, la bouche et les yeux remplis de boue, les os des jambes fracassés et tous les membres mutilés."
>
> Mais l'apostolat de Racle avait laissé des racines assez pro-

fondes pour qu'en dépit des vicissitudes politiques les Abenakis demeurassent Catholiques.....

On garde encore, à Boston, à côté du dictionnaire dont Racle se servait pour catéchiser, le coffre où il rangeait ses papiers, et sur lequel deux dessins, assez sommaires, représentaient la flagellation de Jesus et le couronnement d'épines. J'aime trouver, dans cette relique même, un symbole de la personnalité historique du P. Racle. Celui que les puritans de la Nouvelle-Angleterre auraient voulu faire passer pour un simple agent politique, vécut et mourut en spectateur et en prédicateur de son Dieu torture, immolé, et en imitateur du Dieu qu'il prêchait,—imitateur jusqu'à la mort.

A Tribute to Cardinal Ehrle.— Rarely does it happen that even cardinals receive such a tribute as that recently accorded to the octogenarian Librarian of the Vatican—Cardinal Francis Ehrle, the distinguished Jesuit whose scholarship has won the admiration of the learned world. Born at Isny, Württemberg, in 1845, he was educated at Münster, Westphalia, at the Maria-Laach, in Freiburg, and at Dutton Hall, Lancashire, England. After ordination he was chaplain of Prescott Workhouse for a brief period, and later became editor of the *Stimmen von Maria-Laach* (now published as the *Stimmen der Zeit*). After a decade of historical study in Rome and elsewhere, he became a member of the administrative council of the Vatican Library, of which he was appointed prefect in 1895. He was the recipient of degrees from several universities, including Oxford and Cambridge. To commemorate his eightieth birthday, a group of admirers representing every nation of Europe with a large sprinkling of non-Europeans contributed towards the publication of a collection of *Miscellenea* for presentation to the distinguished celebrant.

The Pope had desired that these Miscellanies might be solemnly offered by himself to the learned Cardinal in an Academia held in the new arm of the museum of the Vatican.

About the throne of the Holy Father which had been erected for the purpose, the members of the Sacred College, the diplomatic Corps, Archbishops and Bishops, Prefects and Scriptores of the Vatican Library and of the Archives and numerous others were grouped.

Upon the arrival of the Pontiff the Schola Cantorum from the German College intoned the "Tu es Petrus." They also chanted, with specific reference to Cardinal Ehrle, a motet: "Lux orta est justo." During the course of the Academia three Benedictines from Einsiedeln executed choice selections on the violin, violoncello and the harp.

The meeting opened with the reading of the Pontifical Brief to Cardinal Ehrle. Then Cardinal Ehrle approached the throne to receive from the hands of the Pontiff the five volumes of Miscellanies printed at the Vatican Press, containing pages especially written for this occasion by historians, and litterateurs.

Dom Ursmer Berlière, Director of the Belgian Historical Institute, then pronounced in French a discourse tracing the scientific life and work of Cardinal Ehrle as head of the Vatican Library. The passage of the Cardinal had left, he said, ineffaceable traces. He also recalled the many precious publications of Cardinal Ehrle, and the important co-operation which he lent Pope Leo XIII when the great Pontiff opened to scholars the secret archives of the Vatican, and reverted to the care which the Cardinal exercised in making photographic reproductions of manuscripts and codes, and finally his organization of the marvelous Library of Consultation.

Fr. Berlière recalled the beautiful examples of virtues given by the Cardinal and the perfection of the priestly and religious life of the great scholar. He ended in extolling the designs of Providence, which had called to the supreme Pontificate the immediate successor of Cardinal Ehrle, underlining the sovereignly delicate thought which had inspired Pope Pius XI in elevating to the Roman Purple one who so richly merited this honor.

Cardinal Ehrle replied in words of moving simplicity, thanking the Pontiff, the Sacred College and all present for their efforts in his behalf. The merit of this solemnity, he said, did not revert to him, but to Pope Pius, who had ordained it in his great goodness and generosity. If the Vatican Library exercised on the world of savants so great an attraction all the merit redounded to the Sovereign Pontiff, for the distributor, said Cardinal Ehrle, but reflects the rays of the sun.

Before having undertaken the office of Librarian at the Vatican, he said, he had visited numbers of libraries in many countries, and knew the needs of scholars when they desired to consult a library. It had been a simple thing for him to place his experience in special relation to the Vatican Library in the scientific world. He recalled the co-operation he had received from the Cardinal Protectors of the Vatican, Cardinals Capecelatro, Rampollo, Cassetta and Gasquet. His Eminence, the Cardinal then thanked all who had contributed to the occasion, and begged of God to recompense them abundantly.

Pope Pius then addressed the following august words to the honored octogenarian:

"To all that has been so opportunely said, and with such great elevation of thought, to your own words, Eminent and very dear Cardinal, and to those uttered by Rev. Fr. Berlière with so much affection and eloquence, We feel that We ought to add some words as a necessary comment in placing in your hands these five volumes of this beautiful and magnificent work *'Miscellanea Ehrle.'* And we believe that these Miscellanea constitute a veritable record.

"This monumental work of the literary and scientific world assuredly speaks of a life wholly consecrated to science and the faith. In consigning these volumes to you, Most Eminent Cardinal, with the most lively and intense satisfaction, We repeat the ancient formul: *"Tibi, tui, tua, de tuis."*

"*Tibi:* to you, Eminence, for with the sentiments of gratitude and of humility which you have in your heart and on your lips, you attribute all to the Holy See, to the Roman Pontiffs, to the Cardinal Librarians, past and present, to your collaborators, to all the great and little assistances you have received.

"The immediate cause of this assembly is you, Eminent Cardinal. It is your laborious life, your activity, it is all that you have done for the library, for the archives, for the Roman Pontiff, for the faith. But it is true, also, that, without you, We should not be here assembled today, at this hour, reviewing the apostolic pages written by your hand. So, 'Tibi,'—to you.

"*Tibi, tui*: yours. This homage pertains to you by many titles. Your Eminent Colleagues, a sacred body, have added prestige because of the honors reaped by one of its members; they are your admirers, your disciples, your debtors in the vast field of science and letters, especially of sacred letters—'Tui,'—yours, and they are numerous. You have a right to feel spiritual joy in considering the gratitude and affection felt for you on this occasion.

"*Tibi, tui, tua.* Tua, yours, because of your great work for philosophy, the history of Rome, the history of the Church, and of civilization during the Middle Ages particularly, diplomacy and paleography, Bibliography in general, and Bibliography of the Vatican and its secret archives,—such are the subjects of the five volumes. They are the field of treasures through which Your Eminence has passed leaving luminous traces and gathering abundant and durable fruits.

"*De tuis,* because these five great volumes show forth, clearly and sensibly, the luminous reflection of your writings, the living and palpitating echo and the influence of your work.

"So: *'Tibi, tui, tua, de tuis.'* This is but a slight recognition, a partial restitution of all the treasures of heart and soul and of intelligence which you have so largely distributed to all.

"It remains with Us to add Our paternal benediction as a gauge of Heavenly blessings, that you, Eminence, may have numerous other fecund and vigorous years after these magnificent eighty which the goodness of God has granted to you. We grant this benediction as auspice of prosperity to all those here present, and as well as a manifestation of the accord between science and faith, the guarantee and substance of all prosperity."

Pius XI Presents Splendid Folio Volumes to University Library.—Through the Apostolic Delegation, the Catholic University has been enriched by Pius XI with copies of several magnificent publications of the Vatican Press. They are large folio volumes in which are reproduced by phototypic process some of the rarest and most important manuscripts of the Vatican Library. Two of these works reproduce very ancient classical texts. One of these has saved for posterity valuable fragments of Cornelius Fronto, the second century teacher of Marcus Aurelius, also frag-

ments of Persius and Juvenal, Cicero's Orations and the Discourses of Symmachus. This manuscript was written in the fifth century, but is now known as a palimpsest manuscript, the original text having been washed out in Christian times to make way for another work. In this case monks of Bobbio, a famous Irish monastery of Northery Italy, rewrote in a seventh century hand a Latin version of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon (451), thus effacing, but not hopelessly, the older classical texts. The other work of classical interest reproduces two otherwise lost books of the Roman History of Dio Cassius, a famous second century Greek historian of Rome. The manuscript is in a fifth century hand and probably came from Egypt. It once belonged to Fulvio Orsini, a well-known fifteenth century Vatican humanist. Scarcely less important to the Church historian and the lover of early Byzantine art are the large folios in which is reproduced one of the greatest mediaeval Greek manuscripts, the "Menologium," or Greek Martyrology, that is, lives of many saints according to the Greek ecclesiastical calendar. This wonderful book was written at Constantinople by the hand of Emperor Basil II (976-1025) who secured also the artists for the beautiful minatures of the work which his pious hand had written out completely. The fourth of these publications is the great Scroll of Josue containing the Septuagint version of the Book of Judges. It is a roll of parchment, one foot wide and originally about ten feet in length, richly decorated with minatures. It has been mutilated at the beginning and the end. This Greek scriptural text was meant for public liturgical use and had a binding post at either end, so that it could be rolled conveniently. Jewish synagogues still use this form for official copies of the Pentateuch, and the University possesses two such minature scrolls. All four publications were executed under Pius X and are known to scholars as volumes VII-X of the great series of "Codices Vaticani" in which are being popularized the richest literary and artistic treasures of the Vatican Library. This Vatican series is equal to the famous Leyden reproductions of the Irish Berne Horace and other classical manuscripts of supreme importance for the correct text of several classical writers. Each of these works is provided with a scholarly introduction in which competent Vatican scholars have told in a full, precise and eloquent manner the vicissitudes of these rare books. How many are aware of this noble service to scholarship, the fine arts, and the higher or ideal interests of mankind? That lamp still glows in the Vatican which for centuries shone over the mediaeval world, and showed the safe path across its storm-tossed waters. Scholarly Catholics might well call the attention of our larger universities and public libraries to this wonderful series of Vatican Codices. They are printed in small editions, are not over-costly, and it will soon be difficult to secure complete sets, or even separate works. There is a good index of them in the Catholic Encyclopedia, in the article "Vatican".

The New Library Building at the Catholic University.—The John K. Mullen Memorial Library was begun Monday, November 17, when ground was

broken on the highest point on the campus, directly opposite the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. This new building will be 207 feet in length and 150 feet in breadth. It will be three stories high with a commodious basement and a roomy mansard roof. The stackage space provides for one million books, of which the University already possesses about 250,000. The reading room will be located on the second story, but will extend through the third story. It will be 140 feet long, 40 feet broad and 40 feet high. Large mural spaces will be provided, on which the history of the growth of libraries in Christian times will be depicted in beautiful and instructive frescoes. All modern library equipment will be provided. Roomy seminars for graduate studies will be arranged in close proximity to the stackage spaces. In the fourteen foot basement will be found all conveniences for the reception, handling and expedition of books, also a bindery, storage vaults, and a cafeteria and comfort rooms for the employees of the library. It is hoped that the building will be completed within two years. Incidentally the new library will release considerable space on the first floor of McMahon Hall, now occupied as a temporary library.

The Secret of St. Cuthbert's Tomb.—English Catholic circles are at the moment discussing the actual resting-place of the body of the Saint Cuthbert. The *Universe* in its latest issues devotes large space to the subject.

Saint Cuthbert, of Lindisfarne, was born of Saxon parents about 635 A. D. in Northumberland, at Mailros (Melrose). It is stated, on the authority of Cardinal Moran and other Irish writers, that the saint was the son of an Irish king, named Muridach, but this statement is now regarded as legendary. He started life as a shepherd, and became a monk of Melrose Abbey. He occupies a large place in Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical history, and after the decision of the Synod of Whitby, in 664, introduced Roman liturgical customs into the house at Lindisfarne, of which he was Prior. He was consecrated Bishop of Lindisfarne in 684, but resigned two years later and retired to his lonely life on Farne Island, where he died in 687.

St. Cuthbert was buried at the Monastery of Lindisfarne, and his tomb immediately became celebrated for remarkable miracles. These were so numerous and extraordinary that he was called the "Wonder-worker of England." The first transfer of his relics took place in 698, and the body was found incorrupt. During the Danish invasion of 875, Bishop Eardulf and the monks fled for safety, carrying the body of the saint with them. In 883 it was placed in a church at Chester-le Street, near Durham, given to the monks by the converted Danish king. Towards the end of the tenth century, the Shrine was removed to Ripon, owing to fears of fresh invasion, but after a few months it was restored to Durham. Here it remained, first in a chapel formed of boughs, then in a wooden and finally in a stone church built on the present site of Durham Cathedral. While William the Conqueror was ravaging the North in 1069, the body was once more removed, this time to Lindisfarne, but it was soon restored. In 1104, the Shrine was transferred to the present cathedral, when the body was

again found incorrupt, with it being the head of St. Oswald, which had been placed with St. Cuthbert's body for safety—a fact which accounts for the well-known symbol of the saint.

From this time to the Reformation the Shrine remained the great centre of devotion throughout the North of England. In 1542 it was plundered of all its treasures, but the monks had already hidden the saint's body in a secret place. The Benedictine's claim that certain monks of the Order hold the secret of St. Cuthbert's burial-place. This tradition was popularized by Scott, in "Marmion":

> "There, deep in Durham's Gothic shade
> His relics are in secret laid;
> But none may know the place,
> Save of his holiest servants three,
> Deep sworn to solemn secrecy,
> Who share that wondrous grace."

A Benedictine, writing in the *Ampleforth Journal*, says Sir Walter's verses are sufficiently accurate "allowing for poetic license as to the precise number of the holders of the secret or their special holiness."

According to a statement made by the Rt. Rev. Abbot Butler to a representative of the *Universe* recently, the secret is held by three members of the Order, who are chosen by the General Chapter, but the custodians are not bound by oath. Nevertheless the secret is closely guarded:

> The secret of the tomb is preserved in a plan and a series of verses in doggerel Latin. As a matter of fact, it is not easy to remembered the tomb's exact position from the clues given in the verses, and I myself went to Durham Cathedral directly after the secret had been revealed to me, so as to get the exact spot firmly fixed in my mir

Some members of the Benedictine Order, notably Abbot Cummins and Abbot Butler, are of the opinion that the secret should now be revealed. Abbot Butler says:

> I think it would be a good thing if steps were taken to examine the secret tomb. Even a negative result would justify an examination because it would finally settle the question. Were nothing found in the secret tomb it would prove definitely that the other [reputed] tomb contains St. Cuthbert's body. As for the suggestion that the body might be found not to be preserved incorrupt, I do not think it should make any difference to anyone at all..... I have no doubt that the Anglican authorities at Durham Cathedral would treat any relics that were found with the greatest reverence, and I believe they would feel highly pleased if any discovery were made. In all probability, in the event of the discovery of the body, the tomb would be regarded in the same way as St. Edward's Shrine at Westminster Abbey, and Catholics would be able to make pilgrimages to the Cathedral in the same way as they do at the Abbey.....I wish to make it plain [continues the Abbot] that while of course I know the traditional spot of the tomb, I have no knowledge of its authenticity, and it should be remembered that Abbot Allanson, the historian of the Congregation, was sceptical about it. On the other hand, the tradition is certainly not an invention, it first appeared in Cressy's *History of Britain*, 120 years after the event. It is hard to say how the tradition was maintained during the reign of

> Elizabeth, when the Benedictines had been driven out of the country, but it is quite possible that the secret was preserved by some of the old Catholic families and then passed on to the monks when they returned, as in the case of St. Thomas of Hereford.

Dom Bede Camm is opposed to the divulging of the secret, and he states:

> It seems to me that the only result of such a proposal, if carried out, would be to gratify curiosity, and that St. Cuthbert's incorrupt body would be looked upon and treated in the same sort of way as that of Tutankhamen.

The Anglican authorities are quite willing to coöperate with the Benedictines in testing the legend, and the Dean of Durham (Bishop Welldon) says:

> Speaking for myself, without the opportunity of consulting my colleagues in Chapter, I may say at once that I think we ought to afford every help which is possible for ascertaining the resting-place of St. Cuthbert, if the Benedictine Fathers are good enough to place at our disposal whatever information has been transmitted to them.

"All Roads Lead to Rome."—Never before was this saying so patiently demonstrated as at the present time. The Eternal City has made elaborate plans to care for the tens of thousands of pilgrims who will visit it during the Holy Year. Estimates vary widely concerning the number of pilgrims. *Le Soir*, of Brussels, believes that it will reach one million. The *Mezzogiorno*, an Italian daily published in Naples, places the figure at two millions. A Central Committee has been organized in Rome to direct the activities of national committees in foreign countries. The latter are organizing the pilgrims into groups and are securing attractive railroad and steamship rates as well as lodgings in advance for the pilgrims and are arranging various details to provide for the comfort and care of the various groups. From the United States it is estimated that from fifty to sixty thousand will make the pilgrimage. Nearly every diocese has a local organization, and in many instances steamers have been chartered for the occasion. The Italian Government are fully alive to the significance of the Holy Year, and systematic preparation is being made for the reception of the pilgrims. Despite the enormous cost of building materials, there has been a large amount of construction in Rome. The municipality is making every effort to cope with the housing problem. Additions to old buildings have been encouraged, and public lots are to be utilized for the erection of hotels on favorable conditions. A reduction of fifty per cent has been made on the price of communal lots and payment has been extended over a period of five years. Mr. John Gleason O'Brien, former vice-consul of the United States in Rome, writing in the current number of the *Review of Reviews* says:

> Persons desiring to construct houses have been exempted from the duty on building materials and from taxes on the erection of

hotels and pensions, providing that construction is completed in time for the Holy Year. The railway administration has ordered reduced rates on building materials. Finally, the Ministry of Finance has waived, against guarantee, the deposits required on the importation of iron, placed on the free list. The result has been that some houses are going up containing 700 rooms while others vary from 160 to 300 rooms. They must be habitable by the end of February. Four new hotels will be ready, namely, the Splendid of 500 rooms, the Flaminio of 150 rooms; the St. Angelo and the Svizzero.

In the event that these preparations will not suffice, the Commune proposes to build temporary structures which will be definitely completed after the Holy Year. The Mayor of Rome, in an interview given the press, stated that there were 30,000 rooms in actual construction which would be completed by the end of 1924.

The central committee has obtained from the Italian State Railways, for pilgrims coming to Rome for the Holy Year, reductions of 30 per cent. for those who travel alone, of 40 per cent. for groups of not less than fifty, and of 50 per cent. for groups of not less than 500 who occupy an entire train. The amount of rolling stock will be further increased to meet the demands of heavy traffic and trains will be run at convenient hours. In Rome two special electric tram services will be organized, the first taking in the four churches which the pilgrims are to visit, and the second uniting the railway stations of Termini and Trastevere. Persons who have visited Rome will recognize the importance of this announcement, as greatly facilitating the handling of traffic.

Rome is not neglecting her streets and other physical appurtenances. A large amount of street-repairing is going on in the residential sections and in some business quarters entire streets are being rebuilt. Thoroughfares and public squares near the principal churches of Rome are being made safe as well as sightly. Particular attention is being paid to the streets and approaches to the Colosseum, the Forum, St. Peters, the Catacombs, etc. The Piazza della Stazione Termini has been much improved and the street car service reorganized.

Obviously the residents of Rome are anticipating a great influx of business as a result of the Holy Year.

The American consulate is making extensive plans for the reception of American pilgrims. Under the direction of Consul Dominian, the staff has made arrangements to register all Americans desirous of doing so. The Consulate will be supplied with information concerning lodgings, handling of baggage tickets, and other details.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here does not preclude extended notice in later issues of the REVIEW).

ADAMS, RANDOLPH GREENFIELD, *A History of the Foreign Policy of the United States.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924. Pp. xv +490.

ALLEN, NELLIE B. AND E. K. ROBINSON, *Stories and Sketches: What People are Doing.* Boston: Ginn & Company, 1924. Pp. 30.

ALMANACH CATHOLIQUE FRANCAIS, 1920, '21, '22, '23 and '24. Paris: Librairie Bloud & Gay.

ANDREWS, JANE, *Ten Boys Who Lived on the Road from Long Ago to Now.* Boston: Ginn & Company, 1924. Pp. 248.

BRICOURT, J., *L'Enseigment du Catechisme en France.* Paris: Librairie Bloud & Gay, 1924. Pp. viii + 128.

BRICOURT, J., *L'Education du Clergé Français.* Paris: Librairie Bloud & Gay, 1924. Pp. 128.

CHITTICK, V. L. O., Ph.D., *Thomas Chandler Haliburton "Sam Slick."* New York: Columbia University Press, 1924. Pp. xi + 695.

CONOVER, MILTON, *Working Manuel of Original Sources in American Government.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1924. Pp. vi + 135.

CORBINIAN, REV. FR., O.M.CAP., *The Laurentianum.* Mt. Calvary, Wis., 1924. The Faculty of St. Lawrence College. Pp. 193.

DRAGUET, RENE, *Julien d'Halicarnasse.* Louvain: Imprimerie P. Smeesters, 1924. Pp. xi + 351.

GARBER, PAUL NEFF, *The Gadsden Treaty.* Philadelphia: The Press of the University, 1923. Pp. viii + 222.

GARESCHE, EDWARD F., S.J., M.A., L.L.B. *The Training of Writers,* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924. Pp. vi + 177.

KIMBALL, EVERETT, PH.D., *The United States Government.* Boston: Ginn & Company, 1924. Pp. vi + 785.

MCNAMARA, SYLVESTER J., M.A., *American Democracy and Catholic Doctrine.* Brooklyn, N. Y.: International Catholic Truth Society, 1924. Pp. 144.

Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society. Worcester, Mass: The Society, 1924. Pp. 266.

Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1923–24. (Vol. 57). Boston: The Society. Pp. xv + 521.

RICHARDSON, DORSEY, PH.D., *Constitutional Doctrines of Justice Oliver Wendell Homes.* Baltimore; Johns Hopkins Press, 1924, Pp. ix + 105.

ROBINSON, JAMES HARVEY, *History of Western Europe.* Boston: Ginn & Company, 1924. Pp. xxxvii + 531.

ROSTAND, EDMOND, *Les Romanesques.* Boston: Ginn & Company, 1924. Pp. xxi + 134.

SCHREINER, GEORGE ABEL, *Cables and Wireless.* Boston: The Stratford Company, 1924. Pp. 269.

SPRING, HENRY POWELL, PH.D., *Chauteaubriand at the Crossways.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1924. Pp. xix + 195.

STUDI, BIZANTINI. Naples: Riccardo Ricciardi, Editore, 1924. Pp. iii + 327.

TERRELL, JEAN, *Les Semaines Sociales.* Paris: Librairie Bloud & Gay, 1924. Pp. 106.

WALSH, GERALD G. S. J., *The Emperor Charles IV.* New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1924. Pp. viii + 87.

YEWDALE, RALPH BAILEY, *Bohemond I, Prince of Antioch.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1924. Pp. 143.